The Constantinian Oration to the saints : authorship and background.

Ison, David John

THE CONSTANTINIAN ORATION TO THE SAINTS — AUTHORSHIP AND BACKGROUND

David John Ison
King's College, London

PhD
1985.

ABSTRACT

The 'Oration to the Saints' annexed to Eusebius' Life of Constantine has been analysed in varying degrees by a number of scholars, but no clear consensus of opinion as to its authorship and date have emerged. The thesis begins by outlining the problem and surveying the literature on the subject, and covers the main areas of discussion. An analysis of the commentary on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue concludes that it was written in Latin on the Latin text, disagreeing with the conclusions of the most recent thesis on the question. Lactantius is considered as an unlikely source for the author of the Oration, but links between him and Constantine suggest that the Oration was written in the same milieu. The Sibylline acrostic in the Oration is considered in its wider context in the work, and in the setting of the early fourth century. Eusebius' works are compared to the Oration, which is seen to fit into the category of early Christian apologetic; a specific study of the use of παῖς is seen to strengthen the case for Constantinian authorship. The relationship between the Oration and the works of Plato is analysed, with the conclusion that the Oration was written in Latin and delivered in Greek. A comparison between the Oration and the works of Constantine shows that they could have been written by the same author. The historical context of the Oration is considered, and it is shown to fit into the Constantinian period. The conclusion of the thesis draws its findings together and relates the Oration to our understanding of Constantine.

CONTENTS

Contents Page

Contents Page

Contents Page

Contents Page

Contents Page

Contents Page

Contents Page

Contents Page

CORRIGENDA

p.13 line 11: for 'book, line and section' read 'book, chapter and section'.

p.14: to list of abbreviations add: 'LCL Loeb Classical Library, London'.

p.33 line 20: for '(v.39,184.3)' read '(v.39,186.3)'.

p.72 line 33: for '(1981/291n.97)' read '(1981/292n.97)'.

p.85 line 18: for '(inst.7.6.11,...)' read '(inst.7.16.11,...)'.

p.106 line 13: for '(laus 1.6,11,12/...)' read '(laus 1.6,11.12/...)'.

p.112 line 3: for 'in' read 'is'.

p.136 line 24: for 'σπλάγχνια' read 'σπλάγχνα'.

p.141 line 22: for 'ἀξύνθετον' read 'ἀσύνθετον'.

p.156 line 15: for '...πάντων. Χριστόν' read '...πάντων, Χριστόν'.

p.162 line 28: for 'v.C. 3.64.2,...' read 'v.C.3.64f.,...'.

p.170 line 34: for 'σπλάγχνοι' read 'σπλάγχνα'.

p.174 line 16: omit 'Catholic'.

p.191 line 25: for '(181.6ff.)' read '(181.16ff.)'.

p.213 line 13: for '(...II.4.9.4.2)' read '(...II.4.9.4)'.

David J. Ison Ph.D.
King's College, London 1984

CONVENTIONS

The 'Oration to the Saints' is referred to throughout the thesis as the Oration: its author is titled the Orator.

References to the Oration are given by page number and line of Heikel's text; there are also a few references to chapter and section.

References to other primary sources often use abbreviations of authors and works: these are generally those in common use, and are indicated in the bibliography. Where reference is made to a particular word or phrase in an ancient source, the page and line of the edition indicated in the bibliography is usually given in addition to the book, line and section; N.B. however that Loeb editions are not given page numbers in this way.

References to the letters of Constantine use the names which are indicated in the bibliography, which gives sources for texts and translations.

References to secondary sources are by name and the date of the work, with the page reference given after the slant. Booklists at the head of each chapter list the works referred to therein.

The List of Contents includes most numbered paragraph headings, but omits long lists of parallels and similarities for the sake of clarity and brevity. Cross-references within the thesis are to the paragraph number; the number of the chapter (in Roman numerals) is given only if the cross-reference is to another chapter.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANCL Ante-Nicene Christian Library, ed. by A.Roberts and J.Donaldson, vols 1- (Edinburgh,1867-).

app. Appendix.

Brandwood Brandwood,L., A Word Index to Plato (Leeds,1976).

CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 26 vols (Berlin,1893-1936).

CN Coleman-Norton,P.R., Roman State and Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents to AD 535, 3 vols (London,1966) I.

CSEL Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol.1- (Vienna,1866-).

GCS Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte (Leipzig and Berlin).

laus Eusebius of Caesarea, de laudibus Constantini.

Lewis and Short Lewis,C.T. and Short,C., A Latin Dictionary (Oxford,1879).

LS Lidell,H.G. and Scott,R., A Greek-English Lexicon, ninth edition, revised by H.S.Jones and R.McKenzie, 2 vols (Oxford,1925-40).

LXX Septuagint.

MS/MSS Manuscript(s).

NPNF A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, new series, vol.1- (Oxford,1890-).

Op.3 Opitz,H.G., Athanasius Werke 3.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites, 1-2 (Berlin,1934-5).

PG Migne,J.P., Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca (Paris,1857-66).

PGL Lampe,G.W.H., A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford,1961).

PL Migne,J.P., Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina (Paris,1844-55).

v.C. Eusebius of Caesarea, Vita Constantini.

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

BOOKLIST

Barnes,T.D. 'The Emperor Constantine's Good Friday Sermon', Journal of Theological Studies, 27 (1976a) 414-23.

--- Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

--- The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine (London, 1982).

Baynes,N.H. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church (London, 1931).

Bolhuis,A. Vergilius' Vierde Ecloga in de Oratio Constantini Ad Sanctorum Coetum (Amsterdam,1950).

--- 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen und Lactantius Divinae Institutiones', Vigiliae Christianae, 10 (1956) 25-32.

Burch,V. Myth and Constantine the Great (London,1927).

Decker,D.de 'Le "discours à l'assemblée des saints" attribué à Constantin et l'oeuvre de Lactance', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978).

Dölger,F.J. IXΘΥΣ 1 Band. Das Fisch-Symbol in Frühchristlicher Zeit (Rome,1910).

Dörries,H. Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins (Göttingen,1954).

Draseke,J. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 25 (1908) 1339-44.

Fabbri,P. 'L'ecloga quarta e Costantino il Grande', Historia, 4 (1930) 228-35.

Hanson,R.P.C. 'The "Oratio ad sanctos" attributed to the Emperor Constantine and the oracle at Daphne', Journal of Theological Studies, 24 (1973) 505-11.

Harnack,A. Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, 3 vols (Leipzig,1893-1904) II.2 (1904).

Hartmann,W. Konstantin der Grosse als Christ und Philosoph in seinen Briefen und Erlassen, Beilage zum Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde (Fürstenwalde,1902).

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius 1, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Kee,A. Constantine versus Christ (London,1982).

Kraft,H. Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 20 (Tübingen,1955).

Kurfess,A. 'Observatiunculae ad P.Vergilii Maronis eclogae quartae interpretationem et versionam Graecam', Mnemosyne, 40 (1912) 277-84.

--- 'Das Akrostichon Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ Σταυρός', Sokrates, 6 (1918a) 99-105.

--- 'Mitteilungen. Zu Vergil, Buc.IV,62', Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift, 38 (1918b) 760-1.

--- 'Platos Timaeus in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Heilige Versammlung', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentlich Wissenschaft, 19 (1919-20) 72-81.

--- 'Vergils vierte Ekloge in der Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Heilige Versammlung', Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin, [Appendix to Sokrates, 8 (1920)] 46 (1920) 90-6.

--- 'Der Schluss der vierten Ekloge Vergils in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Pastor Bonus, 33 (1920-1) 55-60.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Pastor Bonus, 41 (1930a) 115-24.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 50 (1930b) 366-8.

--- 'Die griechische Ubersetzer von Vergils vierter Ekloge in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 35 (1936a) 97-100.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantin und die Sibylle', Theologische Quartalschrift, 117 (1936b) 11-26.

--- 'Latein-Griechisch', Glotta, 25 (1936c) 274-6.

--- 'Die griechische Ubersetzung der Vierten Ekloge Vergils', Mnemosyne, third series, 5 (1937) 283-8.

--- 'Zur Echtheitsfrage und Datierung der Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, 1 (1948) 355-8.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologie und Glaube, 39 (1949) 167-74.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 130 (1950) 145-65.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantin und die Erythräische Sibylle', Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, 4 (1952) 42-57.

Loeschcke,G. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, usw.', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 12 (1910) 357-9.

Mancini,A. 'La Pretesa Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum', Studi Storici, 3 (1894) 92-117,207-28.

Pfättisch,J.M. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen - auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

--- 'Platos Einfluss auf die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 92 (1910) 399-417.

--- Die Vierte Ekloge Vergils in der Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen, Programm des Kgl. Gymnasiums im Benediktinerkloster Ettal für das Schuljahr (München,1912-13).

--- 'Die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', in ed. Dölger,F.J., Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, Supplementheft der Römischen Quartalschrift, 19 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1913a) pp.96-121.

Piganiol,A. 'Dates Constantiniennes', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, 12 (1932) 369-72.

Rauschen,G. 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Literarische Rundschau für das katholische Deutschland, 36 (1910) 68-70.

Rist,J.M. 'Basil's "Neoplatonism": Its Background and Nature', in ed. Fedwick,P.J., Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium, Part 1 (Toronto,1981) pp.137-220.

Rossignol,J.P. Virgile et Constantine le Grand (Paris,1845).

Schultze,V. 'Quellenuntersuchungen zur Vita Constantini des Eusebius', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 14 (1894) 503-55.

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 29 (1908) 3096-9.

--- 'Eusebios von Caesarea', in ed. Pauly,F. and Wissowa,G., Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, vols 1- (Stuttgart,1893-) VI (1909) coll.1370-1439.

Stiglmayr,J. 'Rezensionen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 33 (1909) 346-52.

--- 'Analekten. Zur Rede Konstantins an "die Versammlung der Heiligen"', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 36 (1912) 865-8.

Vogt,J. 'Constantinus der Grosse', in ed. Klauser,T., Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, vols 1- (Leipzig,1941-) III (Stuttgart,1957) coll.306-79.

Wendland,P. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen: Eusebius Werke 1, hrsg.von I. Heikel, usw.', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 22 (1902) 225-36.

Winkelmann,F. 'Zur Vorgeschichte von I.A.Heikels Edition der Vita Constantini', Eirene, 3 (1964) 119-22.

1. THE ORATION

Appended to Eusebius' 'Life of Constantine' is a document headed 'Oration of the Emperor Constantine, which he addressed to the assembly of the saints'. It has been preserved for posterity by the bishop of Caesarea, who announced (v.C.4.32) his intention of attaching an oration by Constantine with such a title to his biographical work, in order to show the emperor's skill in the composition of his sermons. The document is in itself intriguing; the question as to whether it is what it claims to be, and can be taken as representing the thought of the emperor himself, has been a source of some scholarly controversy. This thesis is concerned to make a thorough investigation of the Oration and the questions it raises in order to see whether a definite conclusion to the controversy can be reached.

The argument of the Oration is reasonably clear: J.M.Pfättisch (1908/3-10) initially misunderstood it by taking the obscure phrase νόσμος φύσεως ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ζωή (154.12) to be the guiding principle of the whole work, but after criticism he produced (1913a) a better analysis which has been generally accepted (e.g.by A.Kurfess 1950/146ff.). In outline, the argument of the Oration runs as follows: after the preface (chapters 1-2), which defers to his hearers and sets the scene of the Incarnation in the midst of man's sin, the Orator embarks on the first main section (3-10), directed against pagan religion. God is sole Lord (3), idolatry is foolish (4), and God alone created the universe (5). God's providence, not chance, rules the world, as nature testifies (6-8). Philosophy leads away from the truth, although Plato was correct in some of his doctrines (9); and the myths of the poets are scorned (10). The second section (11-21) is in general about the truth of Christianity. After discussing Christ's coming to earth in response to man's evil (11), the Orator deals with two philosophical objections to his doctrine and affirms God's superiority and man's salvation through obedience, even unto martyrdom (12-14). He then reaffirms the history of Christ's coming and its practical benefits for men (15). The rest of the section concerns the testimony of prophecy to Christ: the history of Moses and Daniel shows Christ at work before his coming (16-17); an acrostic found in the Erythraean Sibyl prophesied of Christ (18); and Virgil's Fourth Eclogue is discussed in detail to show how he predicted the coming of Christ (19-21). The third main section (22-5) concerns recent history: military victory is given by Christ, and the ideas of the persecutors are mocked (22); the superiority of Christianity is affirmed (23); and the terrible

fate of some of the persecutors is discussed, along with God's mercy in the liberation from evil tyranny (24-5). The epilogue (26) ascribes credit to God for the Orator's victories, and enjoins continual prayer for state security to the supreme Christ.

2. THE DEBATE

There have been five overlapping phases of debate about the nature of the Oration.

2.1: Beginnings

Henricus Valesius produced a text of the Oration in 1659 with critical notes (reproduced in PG 20/1229-1316) which provided a starting point for modern criticism of the Oration. The first attempt at a critical text was published by Heinichen in 1830, and re-published in a revised form in 1869 (see I.A.Heikel 1902/xliv); this did not however make use of the best MS, Vaticanus 149 (V). The first critical discussion of the Oration was produced by J.P.Rossignol (1845), who concentrated on the discussion of the Fourth Eclogue, but also looked at links between the Oration and the works of Lactantius and Plato as well as historical allusions in the Oration. His analysis was superficial; he concluded that the Oration was a forgery by Eusebius, but the book he promised to prove this assertion never appeared. A.Mancini (1894) was the first author to take issue with Rossignol: he demolished the case for Eusebian authorship of the Oration, listed correspondences between it and the works of Lactantius and Constantine's letters, and concluded that it was a forgery, dated well after the time of Augustine on the basis of the extra verse of the acrostic. In the same year, V.Schultze (1894/541-51) also analysed correspondences with Lactantius, and concluded that the Oration was a Latin document which had been heavily re-worked by a Greek author, although it was possible that Eusebius had already found it in this state. And at the end of his short enquiry into the ideas found in Constantine's letters, W.Hartmann (1902/32f.) argued that although Constantine knew no Plato, the text of the Oration was a literal Latin translation, and thus it was based on a Constantinian core that had been revised by a Latin theologian.

2.2: Heikel and Pfättisch

With the publication of Heikel's edition of the Oration in the GCS series (1902) there was an increase in the attention paid to it by scholars. Heikel's edition used the early MS V, and despite its faults (compare F.Winkelmann 1964) it remains the only critical edition extant. Heikel's introduction assessed the Oration (pp.xci-cii), making reference to Rossignol, Mancini and Schultze; after considering sources he concluded that a fifth-century forger had used Eusebius' works, Constantine's letters and other materials to construct the text. P.Wendland's (1902) review of Heikel concentrated on the Oration and raised doubts against many of his arguments, concluding that it was a document of Constantinian propaganda produced by a secretary from some notes made by the emperor. A.Harnack (1904/116f.) stated that Heikel's reasoning was not compelling, and he saw the Oration as authentic; E.Schwartz (1909/1427f.) likewise disagreed with Heikel and upheld the Oration's genuineness. Pfättisch (1908) responded to their debate by producing a comprehensive discussion of the Oration: he discussed its form, arguments against authenticity, the Fourth Eclogue, Plato, sources and theology, and argued that it was partially a Constantinian draft with a Greek reviser responsible for most of the philosophy and theology. His reviewers were guardedly hostile: E.Schwartz (1908) pointed out his lack of historical sense and the way he glossed over Latinisms in the text, and together with G.Loeschcke (1910) attacked his emphasis on parallels with Plato; J.Dräseke (1908) and G.Rauschen (1910) thought that Pfättisch was illogical and should have abided by the thesis of a Greek forger. But J.Stiglmayr (1909) agreed with Pfättisch while disputing his interpretation of the commentary on Virgil; and in his discussion of the acrostic, F.J.Dölger (1910) also agreed with Pfättisch's conclusion. Pfättisch (1910) responded to his critics by arguing in detail for the author's knowledge of Plato in chapters three, nine and eleven. At the same time, Heikel (1911) replied to criticisms of his ideas by a detailed commentary on the Oration which was more extreme in ideas and tone than his earlier work, dismissing the Orator as a rhetorical pedant who abused his sources: he noted that there were many similarities between phrases and ideas in the Oration and other works, and concluded that there had been a poor use of sources, without considering alternative explanations. Stiglmayr (1912) abandoned his earlier position and agreed with Heikel that the Oration was a forgery on the basis that Jerome had criticised Christian interpretations of Virgil but not mentioned

the Oration. This was refuted by Pfättisch (1912-13) in his detailed analysis of the commentary on the Fourth Eclogue, which proved against Heikel that the commentary was based on the Latin verses. He followed this up (1913a) with a commentary on the Oration which was directed against Heikel in order to show the Constantinian nature of the document.

2.3: Kurfess

After the First World War, the main protagonist in the debate about the Oration was A.Kurfess, who looked particularly at Virgil and the Sibyl. He had already (1912) written an article on the Latin and Greek of the Eclogue, to which he devoted further studies (1918b,1920, 1920-1,1930b,1936a,1936c,1937) in order to show that the commentary was written on the Latin verses, as well as considering the acrostic (1918a), the text of which he held to have been inserted after the Oration was translated. He responded to Pfättisch's article on Plato by arguing (1919-20) that the Orator used Cicero's Latin translation of the Timaeus, and in the same article suggested that the Oration was delivered in 313. Pfättisch's thesis precluded the Oration having been delivered by Constantine, but Kurfess' more conservative position brought the issue of historical context more to the fore: he restated his conclusion (1930a) which P.Fabbri (1930) accepted, and N.H.Baynes (1931/56) noted this while remaining sceptical about the extent to which the Oration was a Constantinian composition. A.Piganiol (1932) demolished Kurfess' argument, linking the Oration with Lactantius' Divine Institutes and its dedications to Constantine, following the idea of dependence on Lactantius mooted earlier by V.Burch (1927/202-7). Kurfess (1948) ignored his arguments on history, but accepted (1936b,1950) that Constantine owed his knowledge of Virgil and the Sibyl to Lactantius, and even tried to show (1952) that Constantine had used more of the Sibyl than the acrostic as a source; he also suggested (1949) that Constantine had used a philosophical compendium as a source for Plato, and put forward some parallels with Biblical material and Constantine's letter to the Provincials in order to show the genuineness of the Oration. In response to Kurfess, A.Bolhuis (1950) undertook a fresh analysis of the commentary on the Fourth Eclogue, concluding with Heikel that it was a Greek commentary on the Greek verses; he also replied to Kurfess' (1950) article on Lactantius by showing (1956) that the Oration was not in fact dependent on his works.

2.4: Dörries and Kraft

In 1929, Baynes had pointed the way forward to a correct understanding of Constantine by analysing the ideas found in his letters. This bore fruit in the mid-1950s with two large studies of Constantine with different perspectives on the Oration from those of previous scholars. Heikel (1902/lxvi-xc) and Pfättisch (1908/77-111) had made some study of Constantine's writings, limited for Heikel by confining the study to the documents in the v.C., and for Pfättisch by his limited objective of finding parallels to ideas in the Oration. But H.Dörries (1954) looked at all the emperor's letters and edicts in order to draw out Constantine's beliefs: and he devoted a whole chapter (pp. 129-61) to the Oration, assessing its ideas and comparing them with the known Constantinian works, and concluded that there were so many similarities that the Oration must be Constantinian, with perhaps some small contribution made by imperial secretaries. He did not however explain the problems in the way of this conclusion, particularly that of the relationship with Plato, and offered no historical setting for the Oration. H.Kraft (1955) was concerned to assess from the Constantinian material how his beliefs changed during his life: at the end of the book (pp.271f.), having dealt with the other letters, he briefly discussed the Oration, weighing up the arguments of Dörries and Heikel. He concluded that there was a Constantinian kernel in the Oration, but it had been reworked by someone with greater literary skill than Constantine, and thus the document could not be regarded as a source for Constantine's thinking; a conclusion echoed by J.Vogt (1957/364-7) in his summary of the controversy about the authenticity of the Oration.

2.5: From Hanson to Barnes

R.P.C.Hanson (1973) reiterated the arguments against the genuineness of the Oration, and opened up further debate on its historical setting by arguing that the reference to Daphne (179.14) concerned the oracle at Antioch, which Julian consulted; the Oration was thus written against Julian in 362 or shortly after. T.D.Barnes (1976a) considered the historical problems in more depth: he accepted Hanson's identification of Daphne with the oracle at Antioch, but put forward evidence to show that it was active shortly before 311. From his analysis of the historical problems, he concluded that the Oration was delivered in Serdica in 317. D.de Decker (1978) also regarded Hanson's arguments as tenuous, and used the parallels between the Oration, Lactantius and Constantine to show its genuineness: he suggested it was delivered by

Constantine in early 325, since it had a pre-Nicene theology. Barnes subsequently (1981/73ff.,notes pp.323ff.) agreed with Decker's suggestion that Ossius might have been responsible for Constantine's philosophical theology, and moved the date of the delivery of the Oration closer to 325. Barnes' influence is seen in the assessment of J.Rist (1981/155-8) who also regarded the theology of the Oration as pre-Nicene and dependent on the Platonism of Numenius.[1]

2.6: Assessment

Scholarly debate about the Oration has suffered from a prevalence of presuppositions. In particular, the similarities between the Oration and other documents have been interpreted to show a dependence which implies either forgery or genuineness, depending on the assumptions of the author. The idea that parallels could be indicative of a similar milieu with no literary or personal relationship is generally ignored in the attempts to prove a degree of literary dependence. The assumption that Constantine was not well educated -- refreshingly challenged by Barnes (1981/73f.) -- meant that the Oration was either a forgery, or heavily revised. The grounds of debate have been primarily on a literary level, contrasting the Oration with the works of Eusebius, Lactantius and Constantine, and in particular discussing the original language in which the commentary on the Fourth Eclogue was written. Although Kurfess and Piganiol commented on possible historical contexts for the Oration, their concern was primarily literary; and Dörries and Kraft dealt in detail with one aspect of literary relationships. Decker argued on this level while suggesting in passing a possible historical setting. It has been Barnes who has systematically attempted to shift the debate from literary to historical ground: his 1976 article does not touch on major literary problems, but assumes that the discovery of a possible historical context is a strong argument for authenticity; and the argument in the text of his 1981 book assumes much which is not proved, while a few disagreements with his assertions are noted but tacitly dismissed (e.g.pp.323n.123,325n.143).

There are then no assured results of scholarship as far as the Oration is concerned. When Baynes wrote (1931/51-6), the idea of forgery seemed defunct, and the assertion that the commentary on Virgil was written in Latin seemed assured. But the work of Bolhuis and the suggestion of Hanson have meant that these have again become live issues, as has the question of the extent of the Orator's dependence on Lactantius and Plato and its implications. Moreover, Kraft

has come to a different conclusion from Dörries on the basis of the same evidence; and Barnes' attempts at a historical approach have neither come to grips with the literary problems, nor produced any certain results of their own, as he himself admits (1982/69n.99). There is thus a need to work through the literary and historical issues surrounding the Oration in order to discover whether there is any way to resolve the different viewpoints of these scholars. Is the Oration a forgery, a work of Constantine, or something in between?

3. THE ISSUES

The question on which most ink has probably been expended in the debate about the Oration is whether the commentary on Virgil was originally written in Latin. If it was, then the case for a Latin -- and presumably Constantinian -- core to the document is assured; and this is moreover a question which can in theory be definitely answered, given the existence of an external standard in the accepted text of Virgil's Eclogue. Once this issue is resolved, then the question of sources and their relationship to the Oration needs to be dealt with: the connection with Lactantius and the Sibyl has been one important topic of debate, as has that with Eusebius and Christian apologetic. The truth about the extent to which Plato is utilised in the Oration, and what conclusions can be drawn from it concerning the Orator, is another question which concerns an inquiry into sources. A comparison of literary form and theological content with the works of Constantine sets the Oration against a Constantinian backcloth to see how closely it fits, and whether Dörries' view of close similarity can be sustained. Finally, the question of historical allusions and setting needs to be addressed, in order to establish whether Constantine could have both written and delivered the Oration which bears his name.

CHAPTER II - THE FOURTH ECLOGUE IN THE ORATION

BOOKLIST

Barnes,T.D. Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

Baynes,N.H. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church (London, 1931).

Bolhuis,A. Vergilius' Vierde Ecloga in de Oratio Constantini Ad Sanctorum Coetum (Amsterdam,1950).

Hartmann,W. Konstantin der Grosse als Christ und Philosoph in seinen Briefen und Erlassen, Beilage zum Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde (Fürstenwalde,1902).

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius 1, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Jones,A.H.M. The Later Roman Empire 284-602, 2 vols (Oxford,1973).

Kraus,W. 'Vergils vierte Ekloge: ein kritisches Hypomnema', in ed. Temporini,H., Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, vols 1- (Berlin/New York,1972-) XXXI.1 (1980) 604-45.

Kurfess,A. 'Observatiunculae ad P. Vergilii Maronis eclogae quartae interpretationem et versionem Graecam', Mnemosyne, 40 (1912) 277-84.

--- 'Mitteilungen. Zu Vergil, Buc.IV,62', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 38 (1918b) 760-1.

--- 'Vergils vierte Ekloge in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin [Appendix to Socrates, 8 (1920)] 46 (1920) 90-6.

--- 'Der Schluss der vierten Ekloge Vergils in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Pastor Bonus, 33 (1920-1) 55-60.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift, 50 (1930b) 366-8.

--- 'Der griechischer Ubersetzer von Vergils vierter Ekloge in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 35 (1936a) 97-100.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantin und die Sibylle', Theologische Quartalschrift, 117 (1936b) 11-26.

--- 'Latein-Griechisch', Glotta, 25 (1936c) 274-6.

--- 'Die griechische Übersetzung der vierten Ekloge Vergils', Mnemosyne, third series, 5 (1937) 283-8.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 130 (1950) 145-6.

Marrou,H.I. A History of Education in Antiquity, translated by G.Lamb (London,1956).

Page,T.E. P.Vergili Maronis - Bucolica et Georgica (London,1960).

Pfättisch,J.M. 'Der prophetische Charakter der 4.Ekloge Vergils bis Dante', Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland, 139 (1907) 637-46,736-51.

--- Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

--- Die vierter Ekloge Vergils in der Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen, Programm des Kgl. Gymnasiums im Benediktinerkloster Ettal für das Schuljahr (München,1912-13).

Prümm,K. Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt, vol.1 (Leipzig,1935).

Rauschen,G. 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Literarische Rundschau für das katholische Deutschland, 36 (1910) 68-70.

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 29 (1908) 3096-9.

--- 'Eusebios von Caesarea', in ed. Pauly,F. and Wissowa,G., Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, vols 1- (Stuttgart,1893-) VI (1909) coll.1370-1439.

Stiglmayr,J. 'Rezensionen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 33 (1909) 346-52.

--- 'Analekten. Zur Rede Konstantins an "die Versammlung der Heiligen"', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 36 (1912) 865-8.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1: Background

The Oration is unique among the apologetic documents of the early church in quoting Virgil's Fourth Eclogue virtually in full, and providing a commentary which draws out at some length its Christian, allegorical meaning. It is included in the context of showing how even pagan authors such as the Sibyl and Virgil could join with the prophets to predict the coming of Christ. The earliest reference to the Fourth Eclogue in extant patristic literature may possibly be an allusion in Cyprian (de habitu virginum 14), where vv.42-5 could be the source of Cyprian's comments about apparel; but, as Pfättisch says (1907/640f.), this is too uncertain to put any weight on. The first definite quotation is found in Lactantius (inst.7.24.11), who quotes a catena of verses[1] with reference to the millenium after Christ's return. The connection between the Oration and Lactantius, the Sibyl and the Fourth Eclogue is important, and is considered in the next chapter; it is important to note here the difference between Lactantius' chiliastic and limited use of the Fourth Eclogue, and the complete treatment in the Oration which refers the interpretation of the Eclogue mainly to the first coming of Christ. This use of the Eclogue is not picked up in later extant apologetic literature: Jerome (ep. 53.7) quotes vv.6f. only to criticise their use in centos which try to apply them to Christ. Stiglmayr (1912) argued that Jerome was criticising the 'interpretation' of Virgil's verses rather than the making of centos, and so would have singled out the Oration for criticism if he had known of it, implying that it was written in the fifth century; with this interpretation of what Jerome is saying both Pfättisch (1912-13/86ff.) and Baynes (1931/52) rightly disagree. Augustine only refers to vv.13f. four times, and vv.4 and 25 once (civ.dei 10.27; epp.104.11,137.12,258.5), holding them to be places where Virgil was quoting Sibylline prophecy regarding Christ. There is no trace of the Orator's interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue being part of standard apologetic in the early church.

It would however not be a surprise to learn that, as far as we know, this somewhat idiosyncratic view of Virgil was not followed by other writers. Educated Christians and pagans would have been aware of the commentary's cavalier treatment of problems in interpretation, especially with regard to the references in the poem to pagan deities. At least Lactantius and Augustine were clever enough only to quote the more amenable parts of the Eclogue; to essay the whole piece was too

bold a stroke of interpretation in view of the way in which it was well known, an attempt which cannot have been assisted in the version we now have by the poor quality of the Greek translation (compare Kurfess 1936a/97f.,1937/284). The question is more why the attempt was made at all. Virgil was certainly a symbol of pagan religious values to pagans under threat at the end of the fourth century (compare Marrou 1956/310); and although paganism was not so defensive in Constantine's reign, the use of the Eclogue may well have been intended to turn to Christian service an inspired work claimed by the opposite side. The context in the Oration, where Virgil follows a quotation from the Sibyl, linked by the reference to the Cumaean Sibyl in v.4, suggests that the author may have had this intention. If Constantine was the Orator, and there is any link with Lactantius, it may be that he seized on Lactantius' cautious use of the Eclogue and pushed it to its ultimate conclusion with an enthusiasm which outstripped more careful authors, who perhaps had a wider appreciation of the Eclogue's place in the literary world. Thus Prümm says (1935/208) that educated readers would have perceived Virgil as weaving a web of literary motifs rather than expecting him to have been actually delivering a messianic prophecy.

1.2: Significance

The use made of Virgil's Eclogue has become very significant in the debate about the original form, date and authorship of the Oration, because it provides the only clear comparative example of the interaction of Latin and Greek in the composition of the work we now possess. Thus to show that the commentary was written on the Greek text of the verses, in Greek, implies, though does not conclusively prove, that the whole Oration was written in Greek, and therefore that Eusebius' statement that Constantine was the author (v.C.4.32) is false, although he may have had some part in its original idea and shape. A coherent hypothesis about how the Oration came to be in its present form has to account for the facts that the Greek verses are in places very different in meaning from the Latin they translate, and that the commentary has both direct verbal links with the Greek verses, and places where it is apparently expounding the Latin. One approach to the problem has been to surmise that the Eclogue was translated and then commented on by a Greek author, who kept the Latin text in mind, accounting for the apparent inconsistencies (thus Heikel 1911/30f.;Rauschen 1910/70; Bolhuis 1950/82f.). But this does not explain why the inconsistencies

are there; either a Greek author would have had a reasonably literal translation of the Latin and would have stuck to the Latin sense, or he would have followed the logic of his Greek translation in order to get round the obstacles to a Christian interpretation found in the Latin verses. A more satisfactory explanation is that there was originally a Latin commentary on the Latin verses: it would have been a Latin rather than a Greek who would have used Virgil apologetically (compare Schwartz 1909/1427), and the use of Virgil as a testimony to the truth of Christianity depended on an interpretation of the genuine Eclogue, rather than a false translation which would be immediately dismissed by an educated reader who knew Latin and Greek classics (so Pfättisch 1908/41f.)

1.3: Explanations

There are four ways in which a Latin original could have become our present Greek text.

1.3.1: Pfättisch The Eclogue and commentary could have been translated by the same person. Pfättisch (1908/41-4) held to this, as an explanation of how phrases and ideas in the Eclogue and the commentary influenced each other: thus places where the same Greek phrases occur in both verses and commentary indicate where the Latin commentary quoted Virgil, and so the translator has marked this by translating by an equivalent phrase in verses and commentary (so Pfättisch 1912-13/8). But this implies (compare Pfättisch 1908/44) that the commentary as well as the Eclogue could have been translated in a very free fashion, so that we are unable to know the extent to which it has been reworked. It also does not explain the discrepancies between the Eclogue and the commentary in their final Greek form, since it might have been expected that the Greek translator would have ironed out any inconsistencies: why would a translator have been very free in translating Virgil, but have stuck to a partly incongruous translation of the commentary?

1.3.2: Kurfess 1 The Eclogue and commentary were translated independently by different people, then brought together and to some extent revised. Kurfess initially held to this (1912/283;compare 1936a/100), as it would have been natural for a poem to have been translated by a scribe with poetic ability (Kurfess 1920/93,1950/162); this hypothesis accounts for different styles of Greek, with a partly Homeric poem (Kurfess 1937/285ff.; see below 2.2.2) and a commentary full of Latinisms (Kurfess 1920/95f.;1936b/18n.1;1936c/274f.). The discrepancies

are thus partly accounted for; but the undoubted affinities between Greek verses and commentary have to be explained by a subsequent reviser (Kurfess 1920/94f.; compare below 4.9.4.2), which again means that we cannot know how much 'Überarbeitung' has taken place, nor indeed why such a revision was not thorough enough to remove the remaining differences.

1.3.3: Kurfess 2 The commentary was translated by one person, and then the Eclogue was translated by another who shaped his translation around the commentary, quoting the Greek translations of Virgilian phrases in the commentary, and leaving out references to pagan gods which the commentator ignored. Kurfess later suggested this, but admitted to one place where the commentary depended on the verses rather than vice-versa (1920/94f.); and this hypothesis does not explain why, as with vv.5f., the Greek verses have a different interpretation of Virgil from that of the commentary.

1.3.4: Kurfess 3 The Eclogue was translated first, and then the commentary was translated by another scribe who incorporated some phrases from the Greek verses, but kept substantially to the Latin original. Kurfess eventually settled on this, and suggested three places (182.26,183.21f.,184.12) where the Latin commentary quoted Virgil directly, and the translator quoted the Greek version of Virgil in the same way in order to make it fit ((1950/162f.).

The last hypothesis seems to give the best answer to the problems posed by the use of the Eclogue in the Oration. The Oration was written in Latin; then the Eclogue was translated in Homeric style, with a Christian interpretation, by a Christian poetic translator; then the prose translator had the task of putting these rather different verses together with the translation of the commentary on Virgil, and solved the problem as best he could by giving a literal translation of the commentary which only incorporated words from the Greek verses where there was a direct quotation of the Latin. By thus accepting that the Eclogue was translated according to different principles from the commentary, the trustworthiness of the Greek translation as we have it is enhanced, and the uncertain hypothesis of a reviser can be dispensed with. Kurfess only made this suggestion late in his writing, and did not work it out in any detail: it is possible to take it further than he did as a tool for understanding the shape of the

commentary as it now stands. But before looking in detail at the commentary, it is necessary to consider the translation of the Eclogue, and its relationship to the commentary in general.

2. THE TRANSLATION OF THE ECLOGUE

The Greek translation of the Fourth Eclogue found in the Oration is unique (so Heikel 1902/xcvii), and raises three particular problems.

2.1: Need

Why was a translation made at all? Educated men, able to understand and appreciate references to the classics, would know both Greek and Latin; and as Lactantius quotes in Greek,[2] so surely a Greek document could quote in Latin, especially an imperial one from a Latin emperor? However, as the works of Eusebius show, Latin was not understood by most Greeks in the Eastern Empire, and Greek was used for most purposes by the emperors in their eastern provinces, including the publishing of imperial edicts (compare Marrou 1956/255-8; Jones 1973/988-97). Despite occasional attempts at translation, Virgil had little effect on Greek culture, being used as a way into learning Latin rather than read as a literary classic (compare Kurfess 1937/283). If the Oration was to be understood in its entirety by more than a few literary cognoscenti, then it had to be completely in Greek.

2.2: Form

Why did the translation take the form it has now? Why was it not a literal translation? As far as we know, the Latin version was that of Virgil, although it is impossible to be sure whether or not vv.2f., 11f. and 46f. were omitted. The Greek verses however definitely omit vv.2f.,10b-13a,46f. and 56b-57, leaving out the names of pagan gods; alter vv.6,10a,15,49,52 and 63 to make a Christian interpretation easier; and substantially expand or alter vv.16,19ff.,21,37 and 40ff. for poetical reasons (see Bolhuis 1950/80ff.). There are two reasons for the translation being so different from the Latin original.

2.2.1: Dogmatic Saturn, Apollo, Pollio, the Parcae and Jove are removed from the text, making it easier to put forward a Christian interpretation of Virgil. These names are not commented on directly, making their removal easy; and the verses which are made more suscept-

ible to a Christian interpretation are either ignored in the commentary or interpreted in an obscure way. This suggests that the translator tried to produce a version of Virgil which would fit generally into the commentary, and which would not give occasion for offence to Christian readers who did not know the literary background and symbols within which Virgil was interpreted by the commentator. An allegorical interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue made allowances for its use of pagan symbols; but their direct use in a sermon as relating to Christ may have been too much for ordinary Christians in the East, who, if Constantine was the Orator, would want to be assured of his orthodoxy rather than disturbed by his continuing contacts with paganism. An amended version of Virgil of this kind was not intended for those well schooled in literature, but as an apologetic device for the general reader.

2.2.2: Literary As Virgil was the model for Latin poetry, so the translator tried to put Virgil into Homeric form for Greeks. The resulting poem was in part extremely prosaic,[3] but was partially a genuine attempt at Homeric verse (so Kurfess 1920/92;Bolhuis 1950/82). Pfättisch (1908/42n.1) also quotes several parallels with Homer: two good examples are the phrases ἄσπαρτος καὶ ἀνήροτος (v.39,184.3) and λάσιον κῆρ (v.52,186.12), which are so unlike what they replace in Latin that they seem to have been included as well known poetic catch-phrases -- and both come from Homer.[4] Dogmatic and literary explanations go some way towards explaining the divergencies of the translation from the Latin.

2.3: Technique

How was the translation made? We cannot know exactly, but it seems likely that the translator of the Eclogue did not make much use of the commentary, since his interpretation of the verses differs in places from that of the commentary, e.g. with vv.5f. Pfättisch (1912-13/83) thought that the translator had been given the different pieces of the Eclogue in the order that they were commented on; but in two places (vv.7,28ff.) the tense of his translation was influenced by the commentary, suggesting some contact between the two. But this view is followed by the contradictory remark that in places (e.g.vv.15f.) the verses had a Christian interpretation which made the commentary superfluous, implying that there was no relationship between them. Pfättisch does not reconcile these; and it may be that the connection of

tense can be explained by poetic looseness rather than a direct dependence on the commentary, as he admits is possible elsewhere (1912-13/78). The general 'fit' of the translator's version into the Eclogue, and its divergence of detail, may be due to his brief, which perhaps gave some general guidelines -- e.g. to omit pagan references, or make a Christian interpretation easier -- but did not specify details. Either the translator worked on the whole Eclogue, and then the relevant verses were inserted into the commentary, or else as Pfättisch suggested he used a catena of verses. Either way, his translation of the verses was, as far as we can tell, left untouched by the translator of the commentary, who incorporated phrases from it, but did not change it in order to make it fit better. There are two particular points at which the textual tradition is so confused that it is impossible to be sure of the original wording (182.13ff.,183.17f.): these may be due to two different drafts being extant, but it is more likely that later copyists tried to correct or improve on what they saw as glaring errors or omissions in the original text of the translation as it related to the commentary, suggesting that the translator of the commentary treated the verses with some respect. This may have been due to his brief, or because Constantine had some overall interest in the Greek translation; thus the translator did not feel at liberty to amend the text.

3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ECLOGUE AND COMMENTARY

The ideas put forward as to how chapters nineteen to twenty-one of the Oration came to be in the form in which we now have them needs to be tested by a detailed consideration of the interaction between verses and commentary. Before studying the detail, however, it is helpful to look at the relationship in more general terms. This can be done by considering the conclusions drawn by Bolhuis (1950/82f.), the writer of the most recent study on the question, in order to discuss the main points at issue. He divides up his case for an original Greek Oration into five points.

3.1: Influence

The commentary shows traces of the translation of the verses. Bolhuis refers to five places where the Greek commentary has an exact verbal affinity to the verses (182.11/26,186.3f./21,186.10/18,183.17/21,183.17/22), missing out another four places which could support his case (183.18f./184.12-15,184.20/22f.,184.29/30,187.6,8/10). Although he admits that you cannot draw sweeping conclusions from what is a relatively small number of literal correspondences, he says: 'they would never have occurred in such a form as they do, if the commentary had conformed to the Latin original' (p.82). Bolhuis is right to see a necessary connection between the commentary and the Greek verses at these points, but he does not discuss the possibility that they may be translations of Latin quotations. The problem Bolhuis ought to be facing is then to explain why there are so few similarities of vocabulary if there is a Greek commentary on Greek verses: e.g. why is different vocabulary used at 182.6-10 in the interpretation of vv.5f.? It seems to be a natural place to quote the Greek, in an apparently close exposition of the verses.

3.2: Alteration

Verses which are substantially altered in the Greek are not referred to in the commentary, and are given a directly Christological slant (vv.6,13,15,18,48f,). Bolhuis suggests that they are not referred to because of a desire not to discuss in detail verses which are so different from the original, because if the commentary had been on the Latin verses, they would certainly have required an explanation. But if an allegorical reading of the Fourth Eclogue is adopted, as the commentator apparently suggests, then these verses in the Latin give little difficulty to the sophisticated reader looking for references to Christ; and the changes made in the translation of the verses are indicative of the principles adopted therein, rather than necessarily being the basis for the commentary. The only verses referred to by Bolhuis in this section which contain an allusion to pagan deities are vv.6 and 49: v.49 is no particular problem to readers, where Jove can apply fairly obviously to the Supreme God; and despite Bolhuis' assertions the commentary does actually have some treatment of v.6 (see below 4.2).

A bigger problem, which Bolhuis does not treat here, concerns the verses which are omitted in translation and their relationship to the commentary. At the first major point where names of gods are left out

in the Greek, the commentary makes a strong reference to Virgil's allegorical approach, apparently to cope with the allusion to pagan gods here (182.16-27). If the commentary was made on the Greek verses, this stress on allegory would be unnecessary. The reference to the Parcae (vv.46f.) may also have been omitted in the Latin verses given in the commentary, or else it may have been assumed, along with the gods in vv.56-9, that the verses showed the subjugation of a pagan poet and his gods to the overall plan and sovereignty of God. The question of why there is no reference in the commentary to the gods in vv.56-9 remains even if the commentary is on the Greek: Orpheus, Linus, Pan, and the idea of a contest are ignored in the commentary, and the hypothesis of a Greek original is thus no help here. It suggests rather that an allegorical interpretation is assumed throughout, and therefore that explanations for this problem are considered unnecessary.

3.3: Comprehension

Some parts of the commentary can only be understood on the basis of the Greek verses. Bolhuis admits that there is a lot of uncertainty, but maintains that to show a dependence on the Greek text in some places makes it likely that all the commentary is on the Greek. He quotes three examples of necessary dependence (183.21-184.15,185.26f., 186.20ff.), of which the most important two are dependent for vocabulary rather than ideas; and all of these are compatible with, or even explained better by, the hypothesis of a Latin original (see below 4.5,4.9). Bolhuis does not consider the question from the opposite viewpoint, i.e. where the Latin text must be the necessary basis of the commentary; but the Latin is the most likely basis in at least six places, where the Greek verses do not cohere with the commentary (182. 9f.,182.16-26,184.14-17,184.28,185.26f.,187.10ff.), and thus by Bolhuis' own criterion, a commentary on the Latin verses is more likely than a commentary on the Greek.

3.4: Digression

The commentary is characterised by digressions. Bolhuis does not say what significance he gives to this, but it appears to be that this accounts for the discrepancies in his case. This can however work equally well the other way round, to explain obscurities in the commentary when related to the Latin text. The digressions show that the commentary was not written in a completely systematic manner, making

more likely the omission of points which we might consider important. The Orator seems to be working on a commentary which is generally systematic, but which depends in detail on his own concerns, which can use the Eclogue as a starting point for his own train of thought.

3.5: Conclusion

'The commentary depends on and confirms [sic] to the Greek translation' (p.83). Bolhuis concluded this by arguing the case for a Greek original, leaving on one side contrary evidence and the problems it raises. A detailed consideration of the text will show that the Latin verses provide a much better basis for the commentary than the Greek, and that this thesis better answers the problems in providing an explanation of how the text reached its present form.

4. DETAILED CONSIDERATION OF ECLOGUE AND COMMENTARY

The following analysis is intended to test out the hypotheses regarding the writing of the Oration; as such it is mainly concerned with the issue of Latin or Greek, rather than with wider questions, e.g. how the ideas in the commentary relate to other writings. It will however be necessary in several places to consider the question of interpretation in order to understand the processes at work in composition. For convenience, the discussion is divided into ten sections.

4.1: 181.20-182.1

The commentator introduces Virgil by a reference to the coming of the Saviour, and the appearance of a new race of men, which leads on to a quotation of v.7 of the Fourth Eclogue, followed by vv.1 and 4. There are four main issues here.

4.1.1: The New Race What is the relationship of ἡ...νέα τοῦ δήμου διαδοχὴ συνέστη to the 'new race' of v.7? Pfättisch (1912-13/16f.) suggested that the commentator included the phrase because the Latin progenies was of uncertain meaning, since it could refer to an individual or a group; the commentator made explicit the reference to the church, rather than adopting the interpretation the context suggests, that progenies indicates Christ; therefore the Latin is quoted, because the Greek is clear enough as it stands. Pfättisch's explanation how-

ever does not rule out a Greek commentary, because even if the Greek verse is clear, it still needs some comment to relate the quotation to its context. It may be that the translator of the Eclogue had some inkling at this point of the commentator's general interpretation, and included it in his verses, but that still leaves the problem of why the Greek wording of the verses and commentary is different; certainly it suggests that verses and commentary were not translated or composed by the same person; but if Pfättisch (1912-13/16) is right to propose that the original wording of the commentary was nova populi progenies, quoting the Latin wording of v.7, then why did the translator of the commentary not put in the equivalent quotation from the Greek, especially when the sense would not be affected?

The answer lies in something that Pfättisch (1912-13/16) dismissed as unimportant, i.e. the use of διεδέξατο (181.20), referring to the succession of Tiberius, and διαδοχή (181.22) of the new race. διαδοχή is an unusual word to use here; the reason is that the translator is keeping in the Greek a pun made by the commentator which contrasts the accession of the emperor with the beginning of the new race. In Latin, this could have been succedo/successus (compare below 4.1.3), with the commentator not quoting the Latin verses directly, but writing something like novus populi successus. The translator kept the pun rather than trying to relate the wording to the verses, keeping as closely as he could to the original. This then implies that the verses were translated independently.

A more tentative reconstruction might be that περὶ ἧς (181.22f.) actually refers back to ἡ...παρουσία (181.21), so that the commentator was actually interpreting progenies as singular, referring to Christ; and this was ignored by or unknown to the translator of the verses. This would fit better with the overall context; but because the Greek wording makes this interpretation difficult, it can only be seen as a possibility in the Latin, which could have been obscured by a poor translation. As the text stands, the idea of a pun helps to explain its difficulties adequately.

4.1.2: ἐφαάνθη (181.24) The tense of this word is aorist; but it translates the present demittitur, and its context in the rest of the Eclogue demands a present tense. Pfättisch (1912-13/17) maintained that the aorist συνέστη (181.22) had influenced the verses' translation, implying that in some way the verses are dependent on the commentary, and that the verses were translated in piecemeal sections. But

the translator of the Greek verses sits light in other places to tense: he substitutes present for future (vv.14,20,21,24f.,31) and past for future (v.28ff.). There may be some reason of poetry or interpretation why this particular verb is aorist, rather than a direct dependence on the commentary.

4.1.3: Bucolics The phrase in the commentary concerning the Bucolics (181.25) suggests as it stands that the passage is well known, and is a quotation from memory (so Bolhuis 1950/29). But Pfättisch (1912-13/18f.) argues that the text of the best MS V should be adopted, so that it would read καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρῳ τινὶ τῶν Βουκολικῶν τρόπῳ, i.e. 'again by another form from the Bucolics [Virgil says]'; this points to the inspiration of the Sibyl as being the primary concern of the commentator, as well as the phrase being indicative of the first verse. However, the emphasis of the phrase is not so much that what follows is a key statement, but that the two verses quoted are taken from the Bucolics as opposed to anywhere else. The reason for this may have been that the commentator had in his mind Virgil's Geor.4.227, which ends ...atque alto succedere caelo, in the context of Stoic hopes about life beyond death. If the Orator has just used succedere, possibly because it was suggested by this verse, and then quoted a line containing the words caelo...alto, he may have been concerned to make sure that his audience knew to which poem he was referring. An alternative explanation could be that his audience knew, not a lot of Virgil, but very little, and the Orator is signalling his source without exposing their ignorance. He may of course have been doing both these things at the same time, for an intellectually mixed audience of Latins or (more likely) Greeks.

4.1.4: The Cumaean oracle The phrase which refers to 'hinting at the Sibyl' (182.1) depends on v.4 being obscure to the reader. The Greek version, which has Κυμαίου μαντεύματος...ὁμφή, 'the prophecy of the Cumaean oracle', is more direct than the Latin ultima cumaei...carminis aetas, 'the last age of the Cumaean oracle'. The Greek has clarified the ambiguous ultima...aetas, which could mean either the final golden age (so Heikel 1911/31), or simply the time for the fulfilment of the prophecy given at Cumae (so Pfättisch 1912-13/20). It thus seems more likely that the Latin verses are the source of the commentary at this point, although the evidence is not conclusive.

4.2: 182.1-10

Verse 5 of this section is translated largely literally; the questions here concern v.6 and its exposition. There are three particular issues.

4.2.1: ἐπανήκειν Bolhuis (1950/31f.) says that ἐπανήκειν (182.6,8) fits the Greek ἥκει...αὖθις better than the Latin redire, although Pfättisch (1912-13/27) thought that redire was a sufficient basis for the commentary. If Bolhuis is correct, then why did the commentary not have a complete quotation of the Greek verb and adverb, but only a related compound? This is a major obstacle in the way of his interpretation, especially when on other grounds the Greek seems an unlikely source for the commentary. All Heikel (1911/32) can say in support of his case for a Greek original at this point is that the commentary is 'sehr frei', admitting the weakness of the case.

4.2.2: Second Coming The commentary clearly refers to the Second Coming: having identified the Virgin with Mary, it explains how she could remain chaste so as to be still eligible for the title on her return. It is odd that the commentator should jump to this interpretation from the immediate context of Christ's first advent; but a reference to the Second Coming is virtually forced by the wording of the verses, where the idea of a return is present in both Latin and Greek. It is interesting to note however that the Greek verses seem to be trying to interpret Virgil to refer to the first coming of Christ -- only αὖθις frustrates this -- while the Latin clearly fits the view of the commentary. The reference to 'lightening', ἐπικουφίζειν (182.10), the world suggests a chiliasm akin to Lactantius' rather than the judgement announced by the Sibylline acrostic; this fits in with the idea that the 'rule of Saturn' was a popular expression for the Golden Age, whilst no occasion is given for this statement in the Greek verses (compare Pfättisch 1908/24).

4.2.3: God Does ὁ θεός (182.9) refer to the rule of Saturn or to the 'beloved king'? Stiglmayr (1909/349) says that the personal 'king' fits better than the impersonal 'rule'. But, as Pfättisch points out (1912-13/30), the Greek reads as though the king is appearing for the first, not the second, time. The translator of the verses seems to have removed the possibly objectionable name of a pagan deity, while the commentator takes it allegorically as a reference to God. Further,

in the Latin verses the two halves of v.6 balance as they do in the commentary, whilst the Greek is weighted towards the king being subordinate to the Virgin; if the Greek was the source, a reader might well have expected there to have been some reference to Christ as the Virgin's child and king, rather than a bare reference to God. The Greek verses, as interpreted, seem to imply that God is subordinate to the Virgin; this would be an odd idea, making it more likely that the Latin is the object of interpretation. Finally, the fact that the Greek verses have 'king' not 'God' suggests that their wording was not influenced by the commentary, but was independent; an assertion supported by their apparent attempt to interpret the verses in a different way from the commentator.

4.3: 182.10-27

4.3.1: Verbal link This is the first occasion in the commentary where a direct verbal link with the Greek verses is apparent: τὸν...νεωστὶ πάϊν τεχθέντα (182.11) appears to be quoted as τῷ νεωστὶ τεχθέντι (182.26). There is a problem in explaining the form of this quotation caused by the fact that the Greek verses incorrectly interpret modo (v.8) as referring to nascenti instead of the imperative fave (see Pfättisch 1912-13/32). If the commentary was originally in Latin, why does it have the same interpretation as the Greek, apparently quoting modo nascenti? Why does it not have nascenti puero (giving τῷ παΐδι τεχθέντι)? This would suggest that there is some connection between the Greek verses and the commentary; but if so, why is πάϊν omitted from the quotation? There may be a dogmatic reason for so doing, but it is harder to omit the 'boy' from the Greek than the Latin. If the supposition that such verbal links are due to a connection between Latin verses and commentary is correct, then there are two particular possibilities as to how this situation arose. Possibly the Latin commentator quoted modo nascenti, and the verse translator knew this and used it in his composition. This however is unlikely because of the way in which he has apparently just adopted a different interpretation of vv.5f. from that of the commentary. On the other hand, the commentary could have had nascenti puero; the translator kept to two words to replace them, but thought that νεωστὶ τεχθέντι made a better link with the verses than παΐδι τεχθέντι. This is unsatisfactory in that it goes against his practice elsewhere, and is not really a sufficient explanation. The only other explanation is that this interpretation of modo was in general circulation at the time the Oration was

composed, so that commentary and verses had the same interpretation without specific links. This is also an unknown factor, though possibly paralleled elsewhere.[5] The one certain thing concerning this quotation is that it has more problems being used as evidence either way than previous commentators on the Oration have allowed for (compare e.g.Pfättisch 1908/40;Bolhuis 1950/82f.).

4.3.2: Text A second set of problems concerns the text of the Greek verses. The second half of the Greek verses (182.13ff.) is textually uncertain: Heikel adopts the hypothesis of a deliberately incomplete line, which Pfättisch (1912-13/35) thinks unlikely because it makes the incorrect translation obvious, and which Bolhuis (1950/33ff.) sees as unnecessary. The question at issue is whether a reasonable Greek text can be reconstructed, and whether it tells us anything about the form of the commentary. Pfättisch (1912-13/33f.;compare Bolhuis 1950/33ff.) has a detailed discussion of the MSS, and opts for the reading: προσκύνει· οὗ μὲν γ'ἄρχοντος τὰ μὲν ἕλκεα πάντα / ...στοναχαί δὲ κατευνάζονται ἁλιτρῶν. He suggests that γὰρ ἄρχοντος is due to dittography, and that the original verb at the beginning of the last verse was lost or corrupted, so that τὰ μὲν ἕλκεα πάντα no longer made sense, and was thus changed by some scribes to μενοεἰκεα. The missing verb is to be found in the confused MSS witness to βρο(ύ)τ(ε)ια καί, and must be a verb in the present, rather than Wilamowitz's adaptation of καί into the perfect ἵαται.

Pfättisch's explanation answers some problems in the text, but suffers from a major weakness in that he can offer no suggestion as to what the missing verb might be. Wilamowitz's suggestion fits better with the context -- with the double ια dropping out, βρότεια ἵαται became βρότεια καί -- but makes it impossible to find a form of the previous line which both includes προσκύνει and scans. It is likely that there was originally a whole rather than a broken line here, which in some way was lengthened (perhaps by the addition of βρότεια) to produce the MSS confusion. The most important word for relating the verses to the commentary is however τοῦ, which occurs in all the MSS, and which has the effect of making ἄρχοντος a genitive absolute, 'while he rules', which fits well into the original verses by providing a bridge between iam regnat (v.10) and te duce (v.13). Thus the Latin commentary omitted vv.11f., and the Greek translator produced a smoother flow than was possible in the original to cover the omission. This implies that Apollo was mentioned in the Latin verses, and was not

left out, giving more weight to the view that the reference to allegory in the commentary applies to the Latin verses.

4.3.3: Interpretation The third question in this section is how the commentary relates to the verses. The commentator stresses the allegorical intention of the poet, implying that without an allegorical interpretation the verses would not have any obvious Christian reference. He also states that Virgil urged devotion to the child in the form of altar, temples and sacrifices, which are not mentioned in either version of the Eclogue. It is debateable whether the Greek or the Latin forms the basis for this commentary.

As far as the stress on allegory is concerned, Heikel (1911/32f.) sidesteps the question by saying that the mention of the names of pagan gods does not fit with drawing out an implication of Christ's divinity. Pfättisch (1908/26) however points out that the poet is said to be drawing the attention of his hearers to familiar customs, suggesting that the verses contain references to pagan religious ideas, which is hardly true of the Greek verses; and Kurfess (1912/278f.) interprets the commentator's remark that Virgil covered up the truth as also implying that pagan gods are mentioned. A similar stress on allegory occurs in the commentary on vv.31-6 which contain the names of pagan heroes, and so require some kind of explanation. Pfättisch (1912-13/36f.) further analyses the Greek to show that it is only the mention of the moon which could be deemed allegorical, and that προσκύνει is so explicit a testimony to Christ's divinity that allegory is scarcely needed. The reference to allegory must have been intended to cover the mention of Lucina and Apollo, and possibly Pollio, showing that the Latin must have been original at this point.

However, the explicit command of προσκύνει, which is a hindrance to the case for a Greek original regarding the issue of allegory, is a help when the other statement of the commentary about altars etc. is considered. As Stiglmayr (1909/349) points out, it gives a better basis for this comment than the more neutral fave. Kurfess (1920/93) attempts to explain this by suggesting that the commentator is putting forward a bold idea in order to divert attention away from the difficulties these verses pose for a Christian interpretation. Pfättisch (1912-13/39f.) maintains that the key to the problem is the relationship between the two halves of v.10, in that there is the ambiguity as to whether the child comes because Apollo is now ruling, or whether the child is Apollo -- i.e., whether there is a comma or a colon in

the middle of the verse. If it is the latter, then Virgil is asking his hearers to worship the child in the same way as they now worship Apollo, i.e. with altars, temples and sacrifices.

Pfättisch's view is sufficient to make the commentary compatible with the Latin verses, but neither he nor Stiglmayr adequately explain why the commentator should go into such detail. Kurfess is probably closer to the truth, in that the commentator used the verses as an occasion for putting forward these concrete actions as a way of hiding the weakness of his abstract interpretation. It may also perhaps have been appealing to see fave as a reference to building temples, when both Orator and audience would have been mindful of the way in which Constantine was using the resources of the state to build churches and order a right way of worship.

4.4: 183.1-16

This section is introduced by the remark (182.26f.) that it is addressed to the wise, continuing the idea of allegory. This may account for its manifest obscurity! There are two particular areas of consideration.

4.4.1: δηλαδὴ τοὺς δικαίους (183.3) This phrase fits badly into its present context. Heikel (1911/33) said that it was a later gloss transferred from the statement at 184.22; Pfättisch (1908/27) said that the similar act of interpretation there showed that it was consistent here, and both he (1912-13/41f.) and Kurfess (1912/279) pointed out that the phrase scilicet iustis fitted well at the end of the Latin v.16, whereas it broke up the thought of the Greek line. The meaning of the allegory was fairly clear in the Latin, except for who the heroes were, which needed some explanation. The Greek verses however tried to make the allegory plainer: hence the incorruptible God, opposed to the corruptible pagan deities,[6] and the extra line (183.4) in the Greek verses which expands v.16 in order to explain it: the heroes are the blessed ones who long for the Saviour's coming. Therefore this explanatory remark shows that the Latin is original, that the translation is pedantic and literal, including the phrase even when it no longer fitted well, and that the verses were translated separately from the commentary because of their different interpretation.

4.4.2: vv.21f. These verses and the comments around them are rather obscure. The introductory comment (183.8f.) seems to emphasise that Virgil foresaw how the Christians would be persecuted, but was able to look forward to the time when they would no longer need to fear. Constantine and Eusebius use ὠμότης of persecutions (e.g.v.C.2.52,p.69.27); it appears that the commentator is following this usage, expounding the wild plants of vv.19f. as the wildness of persecution, which the poet then says (φησίν, added for emphasis) will give way to peace and order in the world. The Latin is more likely here, because the Greek repeats Σοί in v.21 (183.10), connecting the two sets of verses which the commentary contrasts. The comment at the end (183.15f.) relates v.22 to the peace which Constantine on Christ's behalf has brought for the Christians, the impersonal πίστις being a reference to the church (compare 184.14;Pfättisch 1912-13/44f.). This comment is on the Latin rather than the Greek, because the tense of the verbs is future in both Latin verses and commentary, and also τοὺς δυνάστας (183.15) fits magnos better than βλοσυροῦς. Pfättisch (1912-13/44f.) has a far-fetched explanation of how the royal court was included because of goats bringing their udders home; it is much more likely, though it occurs in both versions, that the lion was a commonly recognised symbol for a ruler, as nowadays lions are regarded as the 'king of beasts'.

4.5: 183.16-184.17

The commentary on vv.23ff. is very important in the controversy about the original form of the Oration, because it contains several quotations from the Greek verses; there are also questions as to what the commentator is referring to in his exposition, which is very full, and which introduces several different ideas.

4.5.1: Text The first question to consider is a textual one. The text of the first two verses is corrupt, with the MSS having different and at times unintelligible readings. Heikel follows Wilamowitz, but his version is unsatisfactory as a translation of the Latin, and is still an incomplete reconstruction. Hence analysts of the text have adopted two approaches to its reconstruction.

4.5.1.1: Greek One approach is to relate the Greek verse to the wording of the Greek commentary. So Kurfess (1912/283f.;1936a/99) suggests that v.23 should end ...σεῖο γενέλθῃ, quoting in support the

reference in the commentary to γέννᾳ (183.22); Bolhuis (1950/44) proposes ...σεῖο τιν' ἄνθη, based on the phrase in the same line of the commentary. Kurfess' suggestion does not fit well with the Latin original of the verses, and neither reconstruction fits all that well into the confused MSS readings. There are also emendations proposed by Stiglmayr and Brambs (see Pfättisch 1912-13/46f.) to vv.24f. in order to bring the verses into conformity with the commentator's interpretation, but these are made on dogmatic grounds with no basis in the text.

4.5.1.2: Latin The other approach is to relate the Greek verses to the Latin original. This is Pfättisch's approach (1908/28f.;1912-13/46): he opposes Heikel's text, not only because it is less of a fit with the MSS, but also because ποίη fits better as a translation of herba than of flores; thus a gap is left in the first line, to be filled by ἄνθη or an equivalent word. In his later work he suggested that the end of v.24 would read better as ὄλλυται ἰὸς / ποίης, partly because he said that it fitted the metre better, but also because the genitive ποίης fitted the majority of the MSS, and ἰός occurred in the commentary below. This is however metrically unnecessary, and is unsupported by any of the MSS.

There is no clear solution to this textual problem. If the emendations in the MSS were due to a poor relationship with the Latin and irregular metre, then having ποίη at the end of v.24 as in MS V is acceptable; and the best suggestion for the end of v. 23 is that of ἄνθη, which fits well in the context of the commentary. Bolhuis is however wrong to suggest τιν' ἄνθη: there is no equivalent in the Latin verses to τινά, and the commentary uses it to interpret ἄνθη rather than give a simple quotation here. It is more likely that τινά is a translation of quosdam, 'a kind of', acknowledging that εὐώδη ἄνθη has its own allegorical interpretation. In that case, as in v.23, ἄνθη would be preceded by a particle such as τότ' or τοι.

4.5.2: v.23 The best way of considering this section is to look at each verse in turn. Verse 23 is particularly difficult to interpret, because of the uncertain translation, and also because we do not know how far the commentary (184.3-11) is meant to be an exposition of it. There are two problems of translation.

4.5.2.1: εὐώδη This could apply to τὰ σπάργανα, in which case the commentary would be based on the Latin and not the Greek; but it is more likely to be following the Latin word order in applying to the word at the end of the verse, either as a feminine accusative singular to ποίη, or as a neuter accusative plural to ἄνθη. If it is the latter, then either the commentary is based on the Greek verses, or else the same translation is used in verse and commentary, i.e. cunabula/σπάργανα and blandos/εὐώδης (compare Pfättisch 1908/28f.).

4.5.2.2: νεολαίᾳ γέννᾳ The translation of the sentence at 183.21f. governs its interpretation. Pfättisch (1912-13/49f.) analysed it to show that νεολαίᾳ γέννᾳ (183.22) was probably a bad translation, which the MSS found difficult, of novae progeniei, which was written as a genitive describing ἄνθη and translated as the dative indirect object of ὤπασε. Thus the Saviour's virtue (183.20) means the power of the Holy Spirit, which is the interpretation of the swaddling clothes of God; the blossoms produced by the Saviour's power mean a part of the new race which is fully revealed after his resurrection, with the commentator here using ἀρετή in a general sense (compare 184.23ff.).

Pfättisch's interpretation seems somewhat forced however, in that it changes the case of νεολαίᾳ γέννᾳ without MSS support in order to find an interpretation for ἄνθη. A better translation is obtained if νεολαίᾳ γέννᾳ is taken to be an interpretation of the Latin tibi. The sentence then says that God's cradle, i.e. the power of the Holy Spirit, will give fragrant blossoms to the newly begotten child. The phrase εὐώδη ἄνθη recurs later (184.16f.) and is there seen to indicate the blossom on the branches which come from the one root of Christ, representing the true worshippers of God. Rather than meaning the new race, the blossom refers to the fruits won for believers by the power of the Spirit in Christ; the 'Saviour's virtue' refers to all the works of the Saviour in his life and the life of the church. The meaning of ἄνθη is actually commented on in the sentences which follow: thus the 'blossoms' given to his followers as a consequence of his coming to earth include the destruction of evil, his suffering, death and resurrection, and the blessings of baptism. Verse 23 then governs the interpretation of the following two verses, which represent some of those fruits enjoyed by those who trust in the Saviour.

The Latin verses therefore provide a better basis for understanding the commentary than the Greek (as against Bolhuis 1950/42). Although a coincidence between the wording of the translations of the commentary

and the verses cannot be completely ruled out, the first sentence of the commentary reads well as quoting the Latin v.23. The commentary's αὐτά (183.21) translates ipsa, while having no basis in the Greek verses: the commentator therefore directly quotes ipsa cunabula and blandos flores, and interprets tibi and fundent. The translator of the commentary simply slotted the relevant phrases from the Greek verses into his translation of the original.

4.5.3: v.24 The interpretation of v.24 is reasonably straightforward, relating the serpent to Genesis 3, and its poison to evil and death. The problem is how the vocabulary of the commentary relates to that of the verses. The Greek verses have an obscure translation of serpens, which Kurfess (1920/94) found was also used by Constantine in the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.11,p.70.22); this could be dependent on the phrase in the Oration, or an independent attestation. If, as Pfättisch (1912-13/50) reasonably proposes, the commentator quotes serpens occidit and venenum serpentis, then why does the translator not follow what is arguably his customary practice in replacing the Latin quotations with their Greek equivalents? ἑρπετόν becomes ὄφις, and ὄλλυται becomes ἀπόλλυται. ἰοβόλος clearly turns into ἰός as an adjective becoming a noun, and ὄφις is clearer than ἑρπετόν, but there is no compelling reason to make the latter change or introduce the compound, which recurs in relation to the Assyrians (184.13). The vocabulary of the Greek verses does occur at one point (184.12), but with a different verb; and it is very difficult to guess at what Latin phrase it represents (Pfättisch does not even try). Perhaps it translates a quotation of herba veneni, but using the vocabulary of the first half of the verse. Textual corruption makes it impossible to be certain about what has happened in this section; perhaps the translator decided that it was too clumsy to quote directly at first, and he did so later partly out of a desire to relate the commentary to the Greek verses, and also because the second half of v.24 in Greek was even more clumsy than the first half, and did not at all represent what the commentator was trying to say by the use of herba veneni. It is however important to note that the problem here is the same for those who argue for an original Greek commentary: they still have to explain why the commentator does not quote the verses exactly when he could have done so.

4.5.4: v.25 There are two aspects to the consideration of this verse.

4.5.4.1: The Assyrians (184.13f.) Rauschen (1910/69f.), in order to sustain his case for a Greek original to the commentary, suggested that the commentator saw Assyrium and was reminded by it of the ruin of that people (compare below VI.8.7). Pfättisch (1908/29f.;1912-13/50f.) had a better case in saying that the commentator misread Virgil as occidet Assyrium: vulgo nascetur amomum. He argued that this was shown by the separation in the commentary of Assyrium and amomum, and also that the verb ἀπόλλυμι occurs once in relation to the snake, and then again referring to the Assyrians. That would make the Latin the basis of the commentary, with the Greek translation being separate from the interpretation of the commentary.

4.5.4.2: ἄμωμον The basis for the interpretation of the last clause of v.25 has either been the view that ἄμωμον means 'blameless [ones]', referring to the church which bursts forth into the world; or, since that argues for a Greek original for the commentary, that amomum was interpreted as referring to the church by the Latin commentator, and the translator added the dimension of the Greek pun (see Pfättisch 1912-13/55n.2). Both these views miss a correct understanding of the passage, which is based not on the Greek pun on ἄμωμον, but on a Latin pun on vulgo, which is translated in the commentary by two Greek words, ἀνέδην καὶ πανταχοῦ (184.14f.), expressing its dual meaning of universal and plentiful (so Pfättisch 1912-13/50), and drawing attention to its importance here. The pun comes in the way that vulgo is associated with vulgus, 'multitude', which is translated by πλῆθος. Originally the Latin commentary spoke of a pouring out (fundo, indicated by the use of φύω rather than θάλλω), which was an allusion back to the blandos flores of v.23; a pouring out which was libere et ubique (so Pfättisch 1912-13/50), alluding to the vulgus of worshippers. Amomum did not occur at all in the Latin commentary, the emphasis being rather on vulgo/vulgus; the translator, with his Latin pun proving untranslatable, struck on the bright idea of substituting a pun on ἄμωμος in order to give a basis for the commentary, and therefore included the word before πλῆθος. This explains why πλῆθος recurs in the next line (184.16) to describe the crowd (vulgus/πλῆθος) of branches growing (nascetur/θάλλον) blossoms (blandos flores/εὐώδεσι ἄνθεσιν). The commentator uses his vocabulary to tie together flores and amomum as both representing the fruits of Christ, rather than the new race of Christians, who are represented in the allegory by the

crowd of branches. The translator follows the commentator's use of Virgil's vocabulary closely in order to keep the link between commentary and verses.

A detailed look at this crucial section thus reinforces the view that the original commentary was on the Latin, and that the Greek translation of the verses was made independently prior to the translation of the commentary.

4.6: 184.17-26

Verses 26f. poses difficulties for all the commentators looking at these chapters. As far as those holding to a Greek original are concerned, Heikel (1911/35) and Bolhuis (1950/51) admit to some influence by the Latin verses, insofar as the commentary follows the Latin in expounding τοὺς...τῶν ἡρώων ἐπαίνους (184.22); but they also point out that the use of ἀρετάς follows that of the Greek verses, and therefore that the situation is confused, with no clear explanation. On the other hand, Kurfess (1912/280) holds that overall the Latin is a better source for the commentary than the Greek, and Pfättisch agrees (1908/32;1912-13/57-60), but without giving a coherent explanation of the way in which ἀρετάς is used in the commentary. These verses have thus remained a puzzle; but if the proposed hypothesis regarding the translation is correct, then there were three stages in the production of the present text.

4.6.1: Commentary The commentator adopted a twofold interpretation of the verses: heroum laudes signified the deeds of the righteous, keeping the theme of 'heroes' as righteous men; facta parentis was equivalent to virtus parentis, which enabled the commentator to exploit the different meanings of virtus; and the original sense of 'manhood' was lost, with the child not being referred to in the interpretation of the verses. Instead it was interpreted in two ways: to mean 'power' (compare Pfättisch 1912-13/58), akin to the way in which Constantine used ἀρετή to refer to the power of God at the end of his letter to the Orientals (v.C.2.42,p.65.24); and also (ἴσως δὲ καί, 184.24) to mean 'goodness'. Power applied to the creation and ordering of the world, and goodness applied to the righteous life of the church. In fact, it reads rather as though the commentator divided up the verses into heroum laudes et facta and parentis...virtus; this does some violence to the obvious reading, but gives a good basis for the vocabu-

lary of the commentary, where ἔργα is equivalent to facta, and ἀρετάς to virtus.

4.6.2: Verse translation The translator of the Greek verses, as seems normal practice, gave a Christian slant to the verses: laudes was difficult to interpret as it stood, and so the translator made use of the multiple sense of virtus, which is also found in ἀρετή (see art. in PGL). Virgil's meaning is that virtus is known by what is seen in heroes and the father; the Greek verses thus state that what is seen in the heroes is goodness, and that the deeds of the father are excellent in promoting manhood.

4.6.3: Text translation The way in which the translator of the commentary operated depends on whether the original had facta in place of ἔργα or ἀρετάς. If the commentator distorted the text sufficiently for the former, then the translation was direct and simple; this is borne out by the translation of facta in the verses as ἔργα, suggesting that it was the normal word used. If the commentator quoted Virgil more faithfully, then the translator may have avoided the clumsy repetition of ἔργα σημαίνων, τὰ δε ἔργα τοῦ πατρός by treating v.26 of the Greek verses as a single unit, where ἀρετάς was the subject of both ἡρώων and πατρός. The substitution of τὰς ἀρετὰς τοῦ πατρός could then be seen as legitimate. The latter option is somewhat tendentious, and would depend more on the Greek than the Latin verses; it is more probable that the commentator quoted virtus parentis instead of facta parentis, which explains how the commentary was on the Latin while having confusing verbal links with the Greek verses.

4.7: 184.26-185.6

4.7.1: Introduction (184.26ff.) This is one of the most difficult sentences to understand in the commentary. The first clause is modelled on the preceding sentence: τὸν μετὰ...τε καὶ...βίον (184.25f.) is equivalent to τοῦ μεταξὺ...τε...καὶ...βίου (184.26f.). The purpose of this is to relate what increases to the church: so it is the church which admirably increases in the midst of the world which contains good and evil, and ἡ παραύξησις refers to the fruit which the earth bears in vv.28ff. The phrase ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνηγμένον (184.27) could mean 'in the analogy',[7] relating the interpretation more closely to the verses which follow, but probably means the higher things towards which the church grows. The second clause is more important in the debate about

the commentary: it is emphasising a slow and steady growth, which appears to come from paulatim (v.28), as the Greek verses have no grounds for this comment (so Pfättisch 1912-13/60f.). It may be that there is a general reference to the slow growth of plants, but it is much simpler to see the Latin as the origin of the comment.

4.7.2: v.28 (184.29f.) Heikel includes the verb ἤγοντο in the text, as do all the MSS, but regards it as a false reading because it should not take the genitive, and suggests alternative verbs in the apparatus. Kurfess (1930b/367) and Pfättisch (1912-13/61) suggest different forms of the same verb which might fit better. Although Heikel is incorrect in trying to alter the verb, there is then the problem of how it relates to ἤγετο in the following sentence. As it stands, the repetition of the verb suggests that the commentary is dependent on the Greek verse. There are however two other explanations: the commentary may have induced an error in transmitting the verse text, with a scribe's eye jumping a line to read the wrong verb stem. This explains the difficulty in making sense of v.28, but does not explain how a comment on the Latin had an imperfect rather than a future tense, as would be expected. Alternatively, the commentator may have quoted paulatim, which was stressed in the introductory comment, reading something like 'the fruit of divine law ripened gradually'; the translator wanted to preserve a quotation at this point, and used the verb in the Greek verse to replace the Latin one. This however assumes that the difficult Greek verb is original, rather than explaining it. It would be fair to say that this section does not afford proof either way, but is compatible with either a Greek or a Latin original.

4.7.3: vv.29f. The Greek translation of these verses is straightforward. The comment on v.29 points out that before God's law was known, there was no fruit (compare Pfättisch 1912-13/62). The comment is occasioned by the Latin, since ἄθεσμον (185.2) refers to the incultis briars, with there being no equivalent in the Greek verse. The sentence after v.30 interprets tough oaks to mean man's folly and evil habits, and then links up all three verses to show that in the midst of this folly -- μεταξὺ τῶν...ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν κακῶν (184.26f.) -- is the reward of God's law, represented by grain, wine and honey. These comments were probably from the Latin, but have become partially obscured in the process of translation.

4.8: 185.7-23

4.8.1: Verses The Greek translation of vv.31-6 is on the whole faithful, making it harder to know whether it or the original is the source of the commentary. The main point of interest is that the tense of vv.31ff. is put into the present, in order to reinforce the verses' interpretation that Achilles' return refers to the future return of Christ. There is a continued use of the names of pagan heroes, which at this point was presumably seen as no obstacle to a Christian interpretation, although it is worth noting that at 185.19 the MSS JME all omit the description of the Saviour as Achilles, disagreeing perhaps with such a blatant acceptance of pagan symbols. The translation of vv.35f. is slightly different, which may have a bearing on the commentary.

4.8.2: 185.13-19 The first section of the commentary contains two ideas. The view that the poet was not a prophet suggests not only that the literal prediction of Virgil -- the return of the heroes -- was incorrect, but also that a consistent and complete allegorical interpretation does not work here. Thus sea and soil, Tiphys, Argo and the heroes (the righteous?) are ignored in the commentary, and are presumably seen as complicating the theme. Second, the stress on the nature of poetry as allegory shows that the Christian interpretation was not at all obvious, and as with vv.8-14, may be due to a desire to cover up references to pagan myths.

4.8.3: 185.19-23 It is worth noting here what Schwartz (1909/1427; compare Kurfess 1912/280) regards as a manifest Latinism, i.e. the use of ἄντικρυς (185.21) in a non-Greek way to translate the original contra, which reinforces the case for a Latin original. The main questions concern this part of the comentary: Heikel (1911/35f.) sees it as compatible with the Greek, and supports his case by comparing μεγίστου πατρός (185.23) with the same phrase in the Greek translation of v.26 (184.20). Kurfess (1912/280) and Pfättisch (1908/34;1912-13/64f.) however point to the vocabulary of the commentary to show that it is on the Latin: the commentary, like the Latin, refers to the city of Troy, and the reference to τὸν Τρωικὸν πόλεμον (185.20) has a slightly different word from the Greek verses' Τρώων: the reference to μεγίστου πατρός is occasioned by magnus Achilles, whilst the Greek verses have no matching source for it; and mittetur is a much more likely basis for the Saviour 'setting out' and 'being sent' than the

lacklustre πειρήσεται. The first two of these points are not very compelling: arguing from the use of vocabulary here is weak because there is no obvious quotation from the verses. The use of μεγίστου πατρός may be occasioned by magnos, or a connection with the Greek v.26, or both; but there is no simple explanation as to why either the comment on the Latin should coincidentally produce the same Greek phrase as in v.26, or why the translator of the commentary should use the phrase at this point and not at the much more suitable 184.23, or why a Greek commentator working with his own verses should have repeated the phrase here with no obvious reference to the verses he was expounding. More general considerations are also inconclusive: the commentary reads better as following the Latin sequence of ideas (Achilles - set out - Troy) than the Greek (Trojan war - Achilles - make trial of again), but the Greek verses contain enough material to account for the comments. It may be possible that the Greek verses lean towards an interpretation which sees Christ returning for a second rather than a first time, unlike the commentary, but this is too uncertain: although it is noteworthy that the commentator avoids the more obvious chiliastic interpretation in order to preserve the reference to the first coming of Christ. The third point concerning mittetur is however decisively in favour of an original Latin commentary. πεμφθείς (185.22) must stand for mittetur, a quotation which the translator could not reproduce from the Greek verse because of the different meaning of πειρήσεται. The concept of 'being sent' is explained by the commentary as referring to the Saviour's own decision as well as the command of the Father, a comment which avoids the implicit subordinationism of mittetur, and which would be unnecessary if the Greek were the object of comment.

4.9: 185.23-187.4

There are six areas to consider regarding this long quotation and its commentary.

4.9.1: v.37 (185.25ff.) The Greek verse is substantially different from the original; Heikel (1911/36) and Stiglmayr (1909/350) agree in seeing the translation as the origin of the comment, which comes from ἠνορέης καρπός. But as Pfättisch points out (1912-13/67ff.), the comment has a much broader reference than that. He sees it as necessary in order to make clear that the final destruction of evil and a new order for the world refers to Christ's second coming, and not to the results of the Incarnation. The Greek verses in fact make that

interpretation plain, and the comment redundant, by their statement that the fulfilment of the verses depends on the fruit of the Incarnation being obtained. Pfättisch is correct to have a wider view, but his perspective is still too limited. The reference to the Second Coming is indeed there in the Greek verses, but not in the commentary, which tends to avoid it where possible: thus the commentary on vv.38-59 (186.19-187.1) is still in the context of the first coming of Christ, and not a future golden age. The commentator has interpreted the preceding verses (26-36) to refer to the time before Christ first came (compare Pfättisch 1912-13/59), when deceit remained because the child was not yet come to manhood; after the Incarnation, all evil was broken at source (ῥιζόθεν (185.27), which is otherwise difficult to account for), and a new order began. The comment is necessary to make this interpretation plain, against a possible chiliastic view which could be suggested to readers by Achilles having been sent 'once more', and by the unreal idealism of the sentiments of vv.37-59. The comment is thus implicitly opposed to the view of the Greek verses, and is based on the Latin, with firmata...aetas being interpreted as an age of freedom and peace.

4.9.2: The verse translation This is generally free, and follows the tendency to interpret in a Christian way. Verse 40 is expanded into two verses, and v.41 is omitted, which is important regarding the commentary; the Greek emphasises the supernatural more than the Latin. The Greek translator made use of the phrase ἄσπαρτος καὶ ἀνήροτος (186.3), which occurs in Homer (Od.9.123) and the Sibyl (Orac.Sib. 3.647,5.276;compare Kurfess 1936c/275f.). It was presumably a well known literary phrase which fitted in well, but which affected how the translation related to the Latin verses. Verse 41 in Greek ends with the prosaic οἶμαι, which is used throughout the prose of the Oration and in other Constantinian documents (see Pfättisch 1908/42). Virgil's vv.42-5 are reduced to three verses and toned down: Pfättisch (1912-13/70) suggests that the translator misread luto as luta, producing the reference to a 'dirty fleece'. Verses 46f. are omitted, presumably because of the reference to the Parcae; we do not know whether they were left out in the commentator's version of the Latin because he ignores them, but they may have been left in under the cover of allegory. Verses 48f. were altered to leave out Jove and the gods; Jove becomes πατρὸς ἐριβρεμέταο, with the Greek verses shifting the emphasis from the arrival of the boy in the world to the final honouring of the

Saviour in heaven. Verse 52 is changed, so that v.51 has to include a separate reference to joy. Verse 52 in Latin applies to the rejoicing of the elements, but in Greek it can be translated as 'and [see] the rejoicing hero of eternal life' (as opposed to Pfättisch's (1912-13/72) obscure rendering that the boy sees the 'joyful hairy chest of immeasurable time'); i.e. it is given a directly Christological application by the translator. The phrase λάσιον κῆρ at the end of the line occurs twice in the Iliad (Il.2.851,16.554) referring to a warrior or hero: the translator included it as another Homeric phrase with no basis in the Latin, in order to help his Christian interpretation of the Eclogue. Verse 53 is important for the commentary: Heikel (1911/36) revised his 1902 text more into line with the MSS to εἴθε με γηραλέον ζῶντ' ἔχε νήδυμος ἰσχύς (186.13), which fits better with the commentary, and seems acceptable in the MSS though being metrically unsatisfactory; Pfättisch (1912-13/75) said that ἔχε was impossible, and it should be ἐχέτω, which makes good sense, but which does not resolve the metre and is less likely in view of the MSS. Verses 55-9 were condensed, leaving out the names Calliope and Apollo and avoiding the direct mention of Orpheus, yet curiously enough using the epithet δῖος, and mentioning both Linus and Pan; the translator left out some names which could offend, while retaining those whom the poet outshone in singing the praises of the Saviour, showing the superiority of Christianity over paganism. We cannot be sure whether the Latin had omissions, e.g. of v.57, but it seems unlikely, as the mention of powerful gods only serves to emphasise the magnitude of the poet's victory over them. Verse 55 (186.15) has the prosaic με πλήξειεν in the MSS; Wilamowitz emended this to μ' ἐκπλήξειεν, which gives a better meaning: perhaps the MSS represented μ' ἐπλήξειεν.

4.9.3: 186.18 In the first sentence of the commentary on this section, there is a direct quotation of some of the Greek verse wording; Heikel (1911/36) said that the comment was included because of the clumsiness of the Greek, which needed elucidation. But it is difficult to see how this sentence helps in understanding the verses, because it simply repeats the themes of vv.50f. without relating them to the obscure v.52; and if the quotation was from the Greek, then θέμεθλα would be expected to be the object of the sentence. As it stands the comment is extremely clumsy, with κόσμου κητώεντος referring to χαράν despite two verbs in between. Pfättisch (1908/34) relates the comment to the Latin by pointing to the repetition of aspice as the basis for ὄρα,

and by saying that the 'elements' do not come in the translation; but neither of these points says much, especially as the elements appear in both versions. It is more likely that the quotation κόσμου κητώεντος represents aspice nutantem mundum, for which the translator has substituted the equivalent Greek words even though they made little sense. An original Latin comment of aspice nutantem mundum, dicit, et elementorum omnium laetitiam fits the form of the Greek comment well, and relates closely to the wording of the Latin verses. The point of the comment is obscured by the chapter division: the commentator is picking out a striking theme in the verses -- the trembling of the world and the joy of the elements -- in order to show how they must refer to the coming of the Saviour, and could not have the more obvious reference in the context to the birth of a mere mortal. The comment is thus on the Latin, and a clumsy Greek translation has obscured why it is there. The repetition of the second half of the sentence at 186.25 is not the first attempt made at interpreting v.51, with 186.18 as an explanatory comment, but a further emphasis on the fundamental nature of the statement made in vv.50f., using the vocabulary of part of this comment in order to refer to both verses as a whole.

4.9.4: 186.20-6 There are several affinities of vocabulary between commentary and verses in this section. There are two direct quotations, ἄσπαρτον καὶ ἀνήροτον and ἄμπελον μὴ ἐπιποθεῖν τὴν δρεπάνου ἁφήν (186.21f.); and Bolhuis (1950/33) points out that παιδὸς...τεχθέντος (186.20) is equivalent to 182.11 and 26, although this may be a general reminiscence of either Latin or Greek. The similarities have been explained in three ways. First, Stiglmayr (1909/350), Heikel (1911/37) and Bolhuis (1950/82) all take these affinites to be evidence for an original Greek commentary. They then have to explain the phrase τὴν ἄλλην ἐπιμέλειαν (186.22) as merely loose commentating, since it has no grounds in the Greek. Second, Kurfess (1920/94f.; 1936b/18n.1;1936c/275) admits to this being the only place where the commentary is based on the Greek, but seeks to minimise the dependence by adopting Pfättisch's view (see below 4.9.6) that the Sibylline section (187.1-4) was interpolated, showing that this particular section of commentary had been worked over at some time. He also stresses Latinisms to minimise the extent of the reworking, though this is a rather uncertain undertaking, and his Latin version of this sentence (1936c/275) is a retranslation of the Greek rather than an attempt to reconstruct the original. Third, Pfättisch (1908/40;1912-

13/74) maintains that the common vocabulary between the verses and commentary is due to the translator echoing the commentator's use of Virgil; he further points out that τὴν ἄλλην ἐπιμέλειαν, while having no source in the Greek verses, is a pointer to the fact that the commentator is here aware of the Latin v.41.

The most plausible view of how the words came to be the same is that of Pfättisch: thus the commentator quoted the whole of v.40, followed by a comment on v.41, and the translator kept in the comment while substituting a quotation from the Greek verses. A further possible indication of a Latin original, which Pfättisch and others have missed, is found in the subsequent statement (186.23f.) that nature is a servant of divine and not human commands. This fits in well, not as a general comment, but as an exposition of v.41: the farmer unyoking his oxen is man's acknowledgement that nature is subject to God and not himself.

4.9.5: The prayer of the poet (186.26ff.) Schwartz (1909/1427), Kurfess (1912/280) and Pfättisch (1912-13/75f.) agree that the commentary on the poet asking for a longer life fits the Latin references to long life and the end better than the Greek references to strength and age: an argument which Heikel's emendation of the text (1911/36) is intended partly to counter, although he does allow that the commentator may have had the Latin original in mind (see Pfättisch 1912-13/76). The Latin is therefore more likely, with the commentary perhaps incorporating ultima vitae, which became τοῦ βίου τέλος (186.26); but there is a possibility that here is a general comment based on the Greek which is coincidentally similar to the Latin.

4.9.6: The Sibyl (187.1-4) The origin of the oracle quoted is unknown (see Pfättisch 1912-13/75n.2); it is introduced to support from pagan sources that only God is the author of salvation. The question about this oracle in relation to the Eclogue is why it is attributed to the Erythraean Sibyl of chapter eighteen, and not to the Cumaean Sibyl of v.4. Pfättisch (1908/44ff.,67) saw this as sufficiently important a problem to make it likely that the whole statement was interpolated by the translator, for whom the Erythraean Sibyl was important, because the original commentary would have ascribed it to the Cumaean to remain in the context of Virgil. This is based on his assumptions (1908/112f.) that the translator-reviser of Constantine was well-versed in Sibylline literature, and that Constantine's Greek was too poor to

have quoted a Greek acrostic in his oration. Therefore the translator inserted chapter eighteen and its subsequent comments into the Oration as well as this passage. But if the same commentator was responsible for both acrostic and Eclogue, then the force of Pfättisch's argument is lost. Kurfess (1936b/15n.3) pointed out that the commentary says that Virgil meant the Cumaean Sibyl by v.4, not that he was quoting the prophecies of that Sibyl: the emphasis is on the Sibyl, not Cumaea. He also (1936b/19f.) suggested some Latinisms in this sentence, and pointed out that because it was not a direct part of the commentary, there was no necessity for a translator to include it. Schwartz (1908/3097f.) said that Pfättisch was wrong to translate γοῦν (187.1) as 'therefore': it should mean 'for example', so that the Erythraean Sibyl is an example of the kind of statement that Virgil is making, not the occasion for it. Thus Pfättisch is wrong in considering this to be an interpolation. The original form of the quotation cannot however be known. Kurfess (1936b/25f.) is certain that it was originally in Latin; but it is now impossible to know whether an otherwise unknown saying is given in its original Greek form, or as a Greek retranslation of a Latin translation.

4.10: 187.4-18

The closing verses of the Eclogue and the accompanying commentary are difficult to analyse because of their obscurity. They have provoked much speculation, sometimes almost as obscure. To simplify analysis, the meaning of the Greek verses and their relationship to the Latin will be considered first, and then the meaning and origin of the commentary.

4.10.1: The Greek verses

4.10.1.1: Text and meaning There are three problems under this heading.

4.10.1.1.1: 187.6 Heikel follows Valesius in adopting the reading μειδιόωσαν ὁρῶν, producing the reading 'the dear smiling mother'; the MSS differ in detail, but generally agree in ascribing the action of smiling to the boy. The Latin risu can be interpreted in either sense; Heikel's reading makes the best sense and is metrically correct, making it more probable; Kurfess (1912/281;1920-1/59) accepts it in order to show that the Latin is the basis of the commentary. The reading is certainly inconsistent with the first sentence of the

commentary, although the Greek poet may have had different interpretations for vv.60 and 62.

4.10.1.1.2: 187.8 Heikel suggests ἐφημερίῳ γ', while the MSS favour ἐφημερίως: both versions are unrelated to the Latin and are somewhat obscure (see Kurfess 1920-1/60). Textually the latter is perhaps more likely, possibly meaning 'daily'; but in terms of sense, Heikel's reading is easier, meaning either 'on that day' or 'mortal'. The choice of meaning is governed by the way in which the verse is interpreted.

4.10.1.1.3: λυκάβας (187.7) The meaning of this word elsewhere is 'year' (see Heikel 1911/38;Kurfess 1920-1/59). Pfättisch (1908/37; 1912-13/76f.) tries to link it to the Latin by saying that it means 'month' (supported by PGL); there is no necessary reason to do so however, and it is necessary to discover the interpretation implicit in the verses to see which is more likely.

4.10.1.2: Latin and Greek The translation is closer to the Latin original in vv.60f, and very different in v.63, to avoid the mention of deus and dea. The main question concerns v.62. Rauschen (1910/69) pointed out that both the commentary and this verse interpret the Latin falsely to relate cui to parve puer. This assumes the reading of the Latin as cui rather than qui, which is accepted by other commentators (Pfättisch 1912-13/80;Kurfess 1918b/760f.;compare Kraus 1980/633-41), and Kurfess agrees with this view of the commentary (1920-1/56;compare Pfättisch 1908/35,1912-13/81). The question is whether the commentary really adopts this interpretation, and if so whether there is a necessary link between the commentary and the Greek verses. It is significant that the Greek verses are different from the traditional Latin Eclogue at the same point as the commentary appears to be; it suggests at the least that this text of Virgil may have been well known in the fourth century, even if only as an alternative reading.

4.10.1.3: Interpretation It is possible to see these verses as being meant literally. Then φέρεν πολλοὺς λυκάβαντας would mean either 'bore for many months' or 'bore [with you] for many years', and the parents are Joseph and Mary, with the birth of Jesus being pictured, ἐφημερίῳ referring to that natal day. This is however unlikely, not only because in the context φέρεν almost certainly refers to childbearing, and λυκάβαντας more naturally means 'years', but also because the Greek verses usually incorporate their own interpretation. A second interpretation is suggested by Kurfess (1920-1/59), who sees λυκάβαντας

as showing that the boy is superhuman, and hence the verses refer to the Second Coming: he does not however develop this. In the context of the rest of the Greek Eclogue, a chiliastic reference here seems quite possible; in that case, the long period of nurture given to the child indicates that μητέρα stands for God and γονεῖς either for God or the Saviour's natural parents: the sense is that the child can now know God again, although while incarnate he suffered privations (compare e.g.Matthew 8.20) which caused his parents sorrow. The meaning of ἐφημερίῳ/ἐφημερίως should then be 'mortal' or 'limited', and the verses are exhorting the victorious Saviour to resume his heavenly rule with God after procuring peace for the world.

4.10.2: Commentary

The question at issue is whether the commentary is compatible with the words or meaning of the Greek verses, or whether it must come from the Latin. The key to the commentary is the first question in the section (187.10). Heikel (1911/37) claimed that οὐκ should replace γάρ so that the sentence is closer to the Greek (and Latin) verses; but Pfättisch (1912-13/80) rightly says that this goes against all the MSS, and gives a wrong interpretation to the sentence. Granted that the words are correct, we need to see first what they refer to, and then how they relate to what follows.

4.10.2.1: Source of 187.10 It initially appears that the question in the commentary could be based on the Greek verses. But the similarities of vocabulary actually make that unlikely. If the commentary was on the Greek, then we would expect a more exact quotation, in a form such as πῶς γὰρ ἄν τοῦτῳ οἱ γονεῖς γεγεληκῶσιν; The use of πρός with the accusative, instead of a simple dative, supports the Latin: ridere ad as well as ridere with the dative means to smile on something; and the use of τοῦτον is a direct reference to hunc in v.63. Also, putting together γονεῖς with ἐμειδίασαν rather than ἐγέλασσαν does not accord well with the Greek. The hypothesis that the Latin is original fits well, if the translator took the first translation of the root rid- as μειδία-, and used it to translate this quotation from Virgil. Risere parentes then became γονεῖς ἐμειδίασαν, with a correct translation of tense as well, which does not hold for v.62 in Greek.

The meaning as well as the vocabulary is important at this point. The traditional text is given by Quintilian as an example of irregularity of number, the plural qui becoming the singular hunc (so Page

1960/131); it therefore had the general meaning that the child must smile at his parents before he could receive a reward. The emendation to cui gives the more natural sense that the parents' favour was required before the blessing of the gods could be given. Pfättisch (1912-13/81) takes the commentary to be referring to this sense of cui, because of the concern of the commentator to show the abnormality of the relationship between parents and child. But, as suggested above, it is also possible that the commentator connected cui to parve puer, so that the verses are not taken as a general condition, but as a statement of fact with regard to the Saviour, in the same way as the Greek verses. He would then have read the verses as: 'begin, small boy; your parents have not smiled at you, nor is he deemed worthy of a god's table or a goddess' bed'. Either interpretation is possible, and both allow the commentator to make use of hunc in his quotation in order to emphasise the link between vv.62 and 63. The relationship of this question to the subsequent commentary defines its interpretation of the verses; but certainly the Latin could be a sufficient basis for the commentator's question, and fits its form rather better than do the Greek verses.

4.10.2.2: Context of 187.10 In order to check the validity of this view of what the commentator is saying, we need to consider how this first statement relates to what follows. Stiglmayr (1909/350), and at one stage Pfättisch (1908/67), considered that the commentary on vv.62f. must be from the Greek, not the Latin; but if the commentator could adopt the same interpretation of the Eclogue as the author of the Greek verses, then the basis for this view is lost. There are two key questions here.

4.10.2.2.1: Parents Who are the 'parents'? Pfättisch (1912-13/80) pointed out that elsewhere in the Oration, the parents are the Virgin and God the Father (compare 168.9-26,182.6ff.,184.23f.,185.21ff.). This however produces a confusion in his interpretation of the following sentences, where the contrast between ὁ μὲν...δέ (187.10,12) is applied to God and the Virgin, and yet the Holy Spirit stands for the Son (compare Kurfess 1920-1/57ff.), and therefore there is only an implied reference to the Virgin, not an open reference to a virginal conception (Pfättisch 1908/36). Kurfess (1920-1/57ff.) applies the μὲν...δέ contrast to deus ..dea in v.63, so that God is deus, and the Spirit and σοφία (187.14) are dea. This has the major weakness of not

explaining at all who the parents are, giving no real link with the commentator's first question. Kurfess and Pfättisch both weaken their case by trying to extend μὲν...δέ over more than the first main sentence; not only does it apply purely within that sentence, but also the gender of the Spirit in the next sentence is either masculine (Latin) or neuter (Greek), and can refer neither to dea nor ἡ πάρθενος. Apart from this, Pfättisch's suggestion fits better into the overall context of the Oration.

4.10.2.2.2: αὐτῶν (187.10) What does this word refer to? If it applies to the boy as being the God of the parents, then that provides the necessary link for Kurfess' view, so that 'parents' belongs with 'their' which is expounding deus. Pfättisch (1912-13/81) however, as Kurfess (1920-1/60) acknowledged, showed that this interpretation was unlikely, because we would then expect the statement ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν θεός to be joined on to the end of the question. He held that αὐτῶν means 'one of them', i.e. one of the parents, which allows for his interpretation of these two statements as each referring to one of the parents. As has already been stated, this extended interpretation does not work. However, Pfättisch's opinion about αὐτῶν is correct; ὁ μὲν... αὐτῶν θεός means 'the one of them who is God', with μέν emphasising that God is one of the parents, δέ not however being expressed. The whole sentence is about the nature of God; the subsequent μέν...δέ (187.11) is included to emphasise that while God is incorporeal, yet he has an individuality distinct from other things, and is not an immanent monad.

4.10.2.2.3: Structure This interpretation of what the commentary is saying is supported by the structure of the commentary at this point. A question is followed by three sentences, which each refer to a half-verse of vv.62f.: the first sentence expounds v.62b, the second 63b, and the third 62a. Then comes a short sentence which sums up the argument of the whole section: τί δ' ὅλως κοινὸν σοφίᾳ τε καὶ ἡδονῇ; (187.14). Like 186.18-24, this section is making one basic point from several verses in the Eclogue: here it is that God has no association with pleasure. This could be expounding 'God' as the Son in his life on earth; but it is more likely that it applies to the Father, because of the first statement about God's incorporeal nature, and also because of the quotation from Aristotle, which refers to the Father when used in chapter three: τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ...οὗ πάντα ἐφίενται (187.13f.,compare

156.9;from Aristotle eth.nic.1.1, see below 4.10.3.1). The reference to the Holy Spirit in the second statement could then be a problem, because of its usual application to the Son; but it is used here in a more general way to describe God, shown by its context between two statements referring to God's nature, because it emphasises the two characteristics of God which are diametrically opposed to bodily pleasure, i.e. his moral holiness and his spiritual nature.

Thus the commentary begins by asking the question as to how the parents could have smiled on the boy, i.e. how they could have encouraged the boy to partake of carnal pleasures. This question is only posed by the Latin; the Greek verses do not link the parents' laughter with any experience of pleasure, but rather see the absence of that laughter as a part of the specific absence at a certain time of benefits otherwise enjoyed by the child. The question is answered by showing how absurd it is to think that God, one of the parents, could be associated with pleasure: he is pure power, without form (though still personal), and not in a human body; he has no association with sexual pleasure, and has no physical appetites, but is pure wisdom. True followers of God know this to be so, unlike the pagans (whose gods are only too ready to seek human pleasures).

This interpretation of the commentary is tentative, but it appears to make better sense than the other views put forward. Any interpretation has to deal with the significance of the parents, the smiling, who 'their' and 'God' refer to, God being not incarnate, the Holy Spirit, the good which all things desire; the apparent meaning of these, or the previous use of the terms by the Orator, give different and contradictory interpretations. It is probable that the Orator has changed his use of terminology at this point in the commentary, and that there is also a poor translation which has obscured the meaning. This means that any reconstruction must be provisional.

4.10.3: Conclusion

Therefore a prolonged study of this section makes it appear more likely that the commentary is on the Latin. There are three remaining points to discuss.

4.10.3.1: Aristotle quotation Is a quotation from Aristotle an obstacle to an original Latin commentary? No more so than are the apparent Platonisms in the Oration, such as Heikel (1911/39) points to here, where the question at 187.14 is similar to Plato's Rep.402e; although like most of the other reminiscences of Plato in the Oration,

it is similar in meaning and form rather than being an exact quotation like that from Aristotle. This quotation could have come about in three ways: the commentator could have given a well known phrase in its Greek form; or he could have used a Latin translation, which was retranslated exactly; or the translator could have taken the commentator's original statement and adapted it to give a good literary allusion (see below V.5.2). It does not make an originally Greek commentary a necessity.

4.10.3.2: v.63 The order of the commentary follows the Greek rather than the Latin v.63. This may be because the commentator is referring in his third main statement (187.13f.) to both halves of the verse, and is simply picking out the more striking part for specific comment. But if the commentary is on the Greek, and is adopting the interpretation of those verses, then there is a need to explain how Aristotle's allusion to the Father can be applied to the Son in his sojourn on earth. This is not a strong enough point to argue from securely: the translator may even have transposed the sentences in order to keep closer to the Greek verses.

4.10.3.3: παιδεία The source of the comment on human and divine παιδεία (187.15f.) is said by Kurfess (1912/282) to be the Latin verses. He does not elaborate on this; but it could be the idea of the child growing, which is in both Greek and Latin, or the idea of the gods educating the child. It seems a rather tenuous suggestion, but it may have a point in seeing a reference to the gods of the Latin verse, which are omitted in the Greek. The Latin certainly provides a source for inveighing against paganism, whilst the Greek does not.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1: Commentary

The commentary was originally written in Latin, and was therefore made from the Latin and not the Greek verses. In the estimation of N.H.Baynes, the commentary is probably on the Latin Eclogue, with the Greek verses being added later: 'but it will be more honest to set down in print the humiliating truth: when one cannot translate a commentary, it is not easy to determine whether the commentator is obscuring the Latin original or a Greek version of the original text'

(1931/55). This is too pessimistic a view; the preceding discussion has shown how the commentary can make sense as it stands, and how it was drawn out of the Latin. The interpretation of the Latin original made by the Greek verses differs from that of the commentary in several places (see above 4.2.2,4.4.1f.,4.5.4,4.9.1,4.10.1.3,4.10.2.2). Further, in most sections the Latin verses are needed to make sense of the commentary, whilst nowhere are the Greek verses essential to elucidate its meaning (see above 4.2.3,4.3.3,4.5.2,4.5.4,4.6.1ff.,4.7.2f., 4.8.3,4.9.3,4.10.2f.). The hypothesis of an original Latin commentary also helps us to understand the Greek form it has taken in at least three sections (see above 4.1.1,4.5.4,4.7.2). There are places which are ambiguous and unclear, but overall the case for a Latin original is very strong.

5.2: Translation

The translation is faithful to the original commentary. The similarities of vocabulary between verses and commentary in Greek, which Bolhuis (1950/82) used to claim that the Greek verses were the source of the commentary, can be rather more satisfactorily explained as the translator incorporating the equivalent phrase from the Greek verse to that from Virgil which was quoted in the original (see above 4.3.1,4.5.2ff.,4.5.6,4.7.2,4.9.3f.,4.10.2.1). Therefore, rather than reworking an original Latin text to a large and unknown degree, the translator has given us as close a translation as he could, making it possible to see in the commentary as it now stands the ideas of the original.[8]

5.3: Commentator

This raises a further question as to the identity of the commentator. If the commentary was originally in Latin, then there is no compelling case for a translator-reviser. The commentary may have been revised in Latin, to become the original of the translation we now possess; but it is a coherent whole in its thinking and approach to the Eclogue, making it more likely to have been written by one person. If Eusebius (v.C.4.32) is to be trusted, then that was Constantine. We cannot be sure about Constantinian authorship on the basis of an analysis of the commentary alone; but we can at least say that there is no substantial problem raised by the commentary as it now stands to stop Constantine having been its author. It could indeed be in his favour that the commentary was originally in Latin

but shows some knowledge of Greek sources (e.g.187.1-4,13f.), bearing in mind Constantine's imperial apprenticeship in the East.

5.4: Implications

The implications of these conclusions about the commentary for the rest of the Oration are to support the thesis of the Oration being written originally in Latin by one author. The commentary fits well into its context, especially at its conclusion, where there is a natural movement into another section with no obvious break in thought. If the commentary has been composed in a different way to the rest of the text and then inserted, it has been done extremely well. In fact, no writer on the Oration has suggested this as a possibility, because of its coherence; the argument about the nature of the whole Oration is over wider issues.

Therefore a consideration of the commentary on Virgil leads to the larger questions of how the ideas contained in it relate to the rest of the Oration and to Constantine's known works. This is considered in chapter VI; but if the translation of the whole Oration has been as faithful as this discussion of the commentary has suggested, then there are grounds for holding these ideas to be genuinely those of Constantine himself. The next step in analysing the Oration is to look at its possible sources and parallels, beginning with the author who, it has been suggested, was initially responsible for Constantine's interest in Virgil: Lactantius.

CHAPTER III - LACTANTIUS AND THE SIBYL

BOOKLIST

Barnes,T.D. 'Lactantius and Constantine', Journal of Roman Studies, 63 (1973) 29-46.

--- 'The Emperor Constantine's Good Friday Sermon', Journal of Theological Studies, 27 (1976a) 414-23.

--- Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

Bolhuis,A. 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen und Lactantius Divinae Institutiones', Vigiliae Christianae, 10 (1956) 25-32.

Burch,V. Myth and Constantine the Great (London,1927).

Decker,D.de 'Le "discours à l'assemblée des saints" attribué à Constantin et l'oeuvre de Lactance', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M.,Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978) pp.75-89.

Dölger,F.J. ΙΧΘΥΣ 1 Band. Das Fisch-Symbol in Frühchristlicher Zeit (Rome,1910).

Dörries,H. Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins (Göttingen,1954).

Fabbri,P. 'L'ecloga quarta e Costantino il Grande', Historia, 4 (1930) 228-35.

Guillamin,M.L. 'L'exploitation des "Oracles Sibyllines" par Lactance et par le "Discours à l'assemblée des saints"', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978) pp.185-202.

Hanson,R.P.C. 'The "Oratio ad Sanctos" attributed to the Emperor Constantine and the oracle at Daphne', Journal of Theological Studies, 24 (1973) 505-11.

Harnack,A. Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, 3 vols (Leipzig,1893-1904) II.2 (1904).

Hartmann,W. Konstantin der Grosse als Christ und Philosoph in seinen Briefen und Erlassen, Beilage zum Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde (Fürstenwalde,1902).

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius 1, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Heim,F. 'L'influence exercée par Constantin sur Lactance: sa théologie de la victoire', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978) pp.55-74.

Kraft,H. Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 20 (Tübingen,1955).

Kurfess,A. 'Das Akrostichon Ἰησοῦς Χρειστὸς θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ Σταυρός', Sokrates, 6 (1918a) 99-105.

--- 'Lactantius und Plato', Philologus, 78 (1923) 381-92.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantin und die Sibylle', Theologische Quartalschrift, 117 (1936b) 11-26.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologie und Glaube, 39 (1949) 167-74.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 130 (1950) 145-65.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantin und die Erythräische Sibylle', Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, 4 (1952) 42-57.

Mancini,A. 'La Pretesa Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum', Studi Storici, 3 (1894) 92-117,207-28.

Ogilvie,R.M. The Library of Lactantius (Oxford,1978).

Opitz,H.G. Athanasius Werke 3.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites, 1-2 (Berlin,1934-5).

Pfättisch,J.M. 'Der prophetische Charakter der 4.Ekloge Vergils bis Dante', Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland, 139 (1907) 637-46,736-51.

--- Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

--- 'Die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', in ed.Dölger,F.J., Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, Supplementheft der Römischen Quartalschrift, 19 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1913a) pp.96-121.

--- Des Eusebius Pamphili - Vier Bucher über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin und des Kaisers Konstantin Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Eusebius 1 (München,1913b).

Pichon,R. Lactance (Paris,1901).

Piganiol,A. 'Dates Constantiniennes', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, 12 (1932) 369-72.

Rauschen,G. 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Literarische Rundschau für das katholische Deutschland, 36 (1910) 68-70.

Schultze,V. 'Quellenuntersuchungen zur Vita Constantini des Eusebius', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 14 (1894) 503-55.

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 29 (1908) 3069-9.

Stevenson,J. 'The Life and Literary Activity of Lactantius', in ed. Aland,K. and Cross,F.L., Studia Patristica, 1 (Berlin, 1957) pp.661-77.

Stiglmayr,J. 'Rezensionen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Zeitzchrift für katholische Theologie, 33 (1909) 346-52.

Vogt,J. 'Constantinus der Grosse', in ed.Klauser,T., Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, vols 1- (Leipzig,1941-) III (Stuttgart,1957) coll.306-79.

Wendland,P. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen: Eusebius Werke 1, hrsg. von I. Heikel, usw,', Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift, 22 (1902) 225-36.

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between the Oration and the works of Lactantius has been a topic of some debate. This is hardly surprising, in that Lactantius was a Latin theologian contemporary with Constantine and known to him, whose works deal with some concerns similar to those of the Oration, and who also quotes the Sibylline Oracles and Virgil. Analyses of the relationship fall into four groups.

1.1: Context

Harnack (1904/117) noted the striking connection between the Oration and the ideas and emphases of Lactantius' works, and used it to argue for the Constantinian authorship of the Oration, without giving a detailed assessment: he argued that the similarity came from them being written in the same context.

1.2: Source

The majority of scholars assessing the Oration have however argued that it shows definite dependence on Lactantius' works, even though that may at times be obscured. Kurfess (1936b/11ff.) and Decker (1978/79-84) held that this dependence showed that the Oration was genuinely Constantinian because it came from the same imperial court with which Lactantius was associated; and Heim (1978) even argued that Lactantius was to some degree dependent on Constantine. Mancini (1894/210-18) and Schultze (1894/542-50) on the other hand took the view that an evident, but not literal, dependence showed that a forger had utilised Lactantius more or less freely in endeavouring to appear Constantinian. Heikel (1902/xciv) was more sceptical about whether any dependence could be shown, although later (1911/3) he asserted that the Orator made an eclectic use of sources, and repeatedly referred to Lactantius to support this view (e.g.1911/10,15 etc.). A further aspect of literary dependence is the thesis which argues that Lactantius was responsible for directing the attention of the Orator to the Sibyl and the Fourth Eclogue: Schultze (1894/548), Kurfess (1936b/13,25) and Vogt (1957/365) suggested this, although Heikel (1911/28) thought it more probable that the Sibyl had been suggested to the forger from the works of Constantine.

1.3: Reviser

The unclear nature of the link between the Oration and Lactantius' writings led Hartmann (1902/33n.6) and Piganiol (1932/370) to suggest

that Lactantius was responsible for revising Constantine's Latin draft of the Oration which was subsequently translated.

1.4: Independent

Some scholars have held that there is little or no relationship between the Oration and Lactantius' works. Pfättisch (1908/71-7) maintained this, while leaving his options open with the caveat that Lactantius' compositions were early enough for Constantine to have made use of them in writing the Oration; and Bolhuis' discussion of possible parallels (1956) concluded that points of contact between the Oration and Lactantius' works were very weak. Both writers however held the view that the Oration was largely or wholly a Greek composition, and were concerned to minimise any relationship with a Latin theologian.

In order to assess these views, it is important to look at the suggested literary parallels between Lactantius and the Oration. It is also necessary to ask the prior historical question as to how much contact there was between Lactantius and Constantine, i.e. whether they had the opportunity to influence one another. The nature of the Oration's relationship with the Sibylline Oracles is also relevant, not only because of its more general implications for authorship and use of sources, but also because of the question as to how far Lactantius could have been responsible for the Orator's knowledge of the Sibyl.

2. LACTANTIUS AND CONSTANTINE

All that is known of Lactantius' life is found in the allusions in his works and in two notices by Jerome (vir.ill.80;Chron.317 A.D.,p. 230e). It is known that he went to Nicomedia from his native Africa to teach rhetoric, and was there as a Christian between 303 and 305 (see op.dei 1.1;inst.5.11.15), but at some stage moved elsewhere, and towards the end of his life was tutor to Constantine's son Crispus. Other details of his life are based on conjecture.[1] It is not known whether he spent time at Constantine's court in Gaul before 316 (compare Barnes 1981/291n.96); Barnes (1981/291n.97) regards his tutorship as predating 313, but this seems unlikely if Lactantius lived until at least 324 (so Barnes 1981/291n.96) and Jerome's extrema senectute (vir.ill.80,PL 23.726) was seriously meant.

We therefore do not know what kind of relationship Constantine and Lactantius had. Constantine may have heard good reports of Lactantius in Nicomedia and asked him to tutor Crispus without personally knowing him; or he may have been taught by Lactantius and spent much time with him (compare Barnes 1981/74). There are however two particular reasons to suggest that Lactantius' relationship with Constantine was not particularly close.

2.1: Propaganda

In his analysis of the de mortibus persecutorum, Barnes (1973) argued for its trustworthiness as a genuine work of Lactantius, written around the end of 314 (pp.39ff.). He went on to point out (pp.41ff.) that Lactantius vilified Maximian and treated Maxentius more dispassionately, whereas Constantinian propaganda attacked Maxentius and regarded Maximian favourably except for a short period in 311-2; and he remarked of Lactantius' opinions of the Tetrarchy that 'one whom Constantine had taken into his confidence or who habitually moved in court circles would surely have written with greater tact or avoided the topic' (p.42). If Lactantius was not presenting the 'court' view in 314, there is no particular reason to suppose he was at court before then either; and it is certainly unlikely that he was sufficiently close to Constantine at that point to be much influence upon him.

2.2: Dedications

The Divine Institutes contain two long dedications to Constantine (1.1.13-16;7.27.2(26.11-17)) and four other allusions to him (2.1.2, 3.1.1,4.1.1,6.3.1); these are omitted in most MSS along with two long dualistic passages (2.8.6,7.5.27). E.Heck (so Barnes 1981/291n.96) has shown that the dedications were added to a new edition of the Divine Institutes about 324, suggesting that Lactantius was not particularly close to Constantine when the first edition was produced. This thesis also means that there is no necessary reason why Constantine should have read the Divine Institutes, which were not written directly to him, but were cosmetically remodelled by an old man who wanted to adapt his magnum opus to the new political climate. The dedications do not show that Lactantius was a literary client of Constantine's; they show only that he wanted to impress the Emperor with his literary ability, and not that he actually did.

The available historical evidence thus leaves open the question whether Constantine and Lactantius influenced each other's thought. Constantine could certainly have read and been influenced by the Divine Institutes, among other works. But there are no grounds save conjecture to suggest that they had a close relationship, and probable reason to suppose otherwise. An analysis of parallels between Lactantius' works and the Oration can make no a priori assumptions about the likelihood of Lactantian influence upon the Orator, whether Constantine or somebody else; the case for this can only rest securely upon a proven literary relationship. Does such a relationship exist?

3. THE DIVINE INSTITUTES

Apart from the quotations of verses from the acrostic, Heikel (1902/xciv,264) lists nine specific parallels between the Divine Institutes and the Oration which have generally been accepted by other writers. A consideration of these followed by other possible parallels and a more general assessment of the relationship between Lactantius' writings and the Oration should clarify the question of dependence.

3.1: Parallels in Heikel

3.1.1: inst.1.2/Or.154.12-15 Lactantius begins his argument by asserting the existence of providence, and mentions in passing that a few men disbelieve it. The Orator says that men have withheld God's rightful worship because they rejected providence. Bolhuis (1956/25f.) points out that Lactantius is making a general remark, unlike the Orator's reference to the world before the advent of Christ. It is also important to note the difference in tone between the authors: Lactantius writes from a background of philosophical knowledge, assuming that men will believe in providence, and later on (7.3.25;see below 3.1.9) upholds providence in an attack on Epicurus; the Orator assumes no philosophical background, and contrary to Lactantius asserts that men have all agreed in rejecting providence. Lactantius includes a reference to the teleological argument here, whereas the Oration does not. There seems little reason to suppose that these passages are a parallel.

3.1.2: inst.1.3.18f./Or.156.19-28 Lactantius and the Orator both make the point that there must be one ruler of the world, or else the

harmony of the whole would be destroyed. Kurfess (1950/152) admitted that there was no verbal link here, and concluded that the Orator had made an independent use of Lactantius; Bolhuis (1956/26ff.) however pointed out parallels in other apologetic writings, and suggested rather that this was a locus communis. His assertion is supported by the different contexts in which the argument is placed. Lactantius is answering objections that a single God cannot control the world by upholding the necessity of a single ruler. The Orator begins with God as the origin of existence and subsequently proves that there must be one God in order to know whom to worship. The same idea is used and expressed differently in the two authors, and therefore does not imply dependence.

3.1.3: inst.1.4.1/Or.154.15-18 Lactantius refers to the testimony of the inspired prophets to the one God, which is shown to be true by the veracity of their predictions, despite the unbelief of men. The Orator also claims inspiration for the prophets, and states that they were disbelieved, but is concerned rather with right worship. Heikel (1911/5f.) unjustly maligned the Orator for distorting Lactantius; it seems much more likely that there is a merely coincidental similarity, especially when comparing Lactantius' ordered exposition of witnesses to the divine monarchy with a few sentences in the general introduction to the Oration.

3.1.4: inst.1.11.24/Or.165.7ff. Lactantius and the Orator both use the stories of the poets to show the corrupt nature of the gods, and both acknowledge that men regard the stories of the poets as less than true. Lactantius allows that poets may embellish details, in order to support his case that gods are apotheosised men; the Orator however maintains that the poets were inspired in speaking about the gods, and that all that they said was repugnant but true, a cruder form of argument. Apotheosis is alluded to in Or.158.2ff. rather than here. It is not surprising that two separate Christian authors should make similar apologetic statements about the poets; the differences show that dependence is unlikely.

3.1.5: inst.1.16.5ff./Or.157.20-25 This is another instance of a common apologetic point, that a literal acceptance of the myths about the gods implies that they continue to have offspring. Lactantius argues from the fact of there being two sexes among the gods that pro-

creation must continue among them, and in the course of the argument asks why so few gods are then worshipped. The Orator starts with the popular view that the gods have children, and pushes it to the conclusion that there would then not be sufficient space to accomodate all the resulting offspring. Kurfess (1950/152f.) was justly criticised by Bolhuis (1956/28f.) for trying to maintain both an independent use of Lactantius and a reference to the Sibylline fragment in Theophilus Autol.2.3, which is much closer in content to the Oration than Lactantius. Heikel (1911/10) also asserted that the Orator was making a loose use of the Divine Institutes and Theophilus, basing his view on his opinion that the Orator was an eclectic rhetorician. The parallels cited by Bolhuis (1956/28f.) are however sufficient to show that a similar idea need carry no connotation of dependence.

3.1.6: inst.4.7.1/Or.168.7-18 In chapter eleven of the Oration, the argument moves from upholding the truth of the Christian way in practice to answer the objection that God could not have a Son, and explains how his generation occurred. Lactantius however has already mentioned the begetting of the Son; he answers speculation on what the Son's name is, and later denies the crude idea that the Son was begotten by marriage. The explanation of how the Son was begotten in inst.4.8.6-12 bears no resemblance to the argument in the Oration. Any relationship here is superficial, and dissolves on closer inspection.

3.1.7: inst.4.15.26ff./Or.181.6-18 In their use of the Sibylline Oracles to testify to Christ both Lactantius and the Orator are aware of the accusation that these are Christian forgeries and defend themselves against it, both making reference to Cicero. This led Heikel (1902/xcv) among others to claim that the Orator is distorting Lactantius' apology. But as Pfättisch pointed out (1908/72f.), the use of ancient authors to attest the authenticity of the Sibyl is found elsewhere in Christian apologetic (e.g.Ps.-Justin coh.Gr.16), and does not show dependence. Moreover, Lactantius only makes a general reference to the knowledge of Cicero, Varro and other ancients concerning the Sibyls (compare Cicero div.1.2,18;nat.deor.2.3,3.2); the Orator makes specific reference to Cicero's knowledge of the acrostic, which, though distorted (see below 5.3.2), has no basis in the comments of Lactantius.

3.1.8: inst.4.25.3f./Or.168.24ff. Lactantius' exposition of Jesus' birth centres on him being both spiritual and physical, born in a new way with a Father of his spirit and a mother of his body, enabling him to partake of the nature of God and man and mediate between them. The Orator is not however concerned with Jesus' status as a mediator, but explains the means of his birth in a series of terse paradoxes, in which spiritual and physical are opposing realities which are not referred to the nature of the Son. The resemblance is here again a superficial one.

3.1.9: inst.7.3.25f./Or.160.14-162.5 As he does briefly in inst.1.2.5, so also here Lactantius uses the teleological argument against Epicurus and others who deny providence. Schultze (1894/546) admitted that the lists in the Oration were much richer, but said that did not obscure the dependence; but as Bolhuis shows (1956/29f.), the use of the teleological argument is a commonplace of apologetic. The length and tenor of the argument in the Oration also shows that, whereas Lactantius took it for granted that his readers already knew and appreciated the force of the argument, the Orator did not, and took the opportunity of giving his eloquence free reign in order to prove his point beyond question. There is no reason to suppose a connection in the absence of any verbal links.

3.2: Other possible parallels

3.2.1: Mancini Mancini (1894/212ff.) suggested a long list of possible parallels, but only one is supported by Schultze (1894/549) as a possibility: inst.1.19.5/Or.182.18-24,165.14-17. The idea that writers in the pagan world were afraid to speak the truth out of fear of persecution provided a useful apologetic argument, which was used elsewhere (e.g.Ps.-Justin coh.Gr. 20 on Plato); dependence is thus unlikely, particularly in that Lactantius restricts poetic falsehood to men being given the name of gods, whereas the Orator acknowledges that poets may obscure the truth about God himself out of fear.

3.2.2: Schultze On his own account, Schultze (1894/548) suggested inst.4.15.4-18/Or.169.3-14 on the miracles and deeds of Christ. But Lactantius' work is much more detailed than the Oration; and lists of Jesus' miracles are likely to be similar because of their common basis in New Testament tradition. Unless there are actual verbal links --

which are not apparent here -- then this is a generalisation which proves nothing.

3.2.3: Heikel In his introduction to the Oration, Heikel (1902/xciv) maintained that chapters three and four of the Oration followed the order of the first book of the Divine Institutes, though there were some differences: he was supported by Kurfess (1950/151ff.). Apart from the specific parallels already mentioned however, this suggestion is too general to be significant. Lactantius and the Orator are dealing with similar issues, and it is thus unsurprising that there should be similarities: the differences are rather more striking, especially that the Orator does not give any details about pagan myths as Lactantius does.

3.2.4: Kurfess Kurfess (1950/153ff.) thought that the dedication of inst.7.27.2 formed the basis for a Constantinian response in chapter twenty-six of the Oration. This could only be true in the most general sense: there must have been much flattery of the emperor, not just in Lactantius or Eusebius, which could have provoked a response. There is no reason to suppose that Constantine is answering Lactantius; e.g. the Orator ignores here Lactantius' reference to the punishment of the persecutors.

3.2.5: Epitome The epitome of the Divine Institutes, written around 320 (so Barnes 1981/292n.99), includes a reference to Plato speaking of two gods (epit.37(42).4, equivalent to inst.4.6.3), which is found also in Or. 163.18-22. Plato is inserted into Lactantius' argument in the context of Hermes and the Sibyl with no further exposition. Could Lactantius have discovered this and introduced it to Constantine? Or could he even have gleaned it from the Oration? Either of these is possible, but it is more likely that they were both written in a similar context where Middle Platonism was popular, and that they were using an apologetic commonplace (so Kurfess 1923/389;Ogilvie 1978/80) which Lactantius did not discover until after he wrote the Divine Institutes.

3.3: Lactantius' theology and the Oration

Scholars have tended to look at particular parallels between the Divine Institutes and the Oration, without looking more critically at how Lactantius' thought compares with that of the Orator. In general,

Lactantius' works are oriented towards philosophy and are logically argued, stressing reason rather than revelation. He sets great store however by the witness of pagan prophecy as apologetic, but even so treats the biblical witness faithfully, unlike the Orator (compare e.g.man's origins in inst.2.12.15-19/Or.158.16-22). He has a philosophical conception of virtue, whilst the Orator is concerned with the practical moral superiority of Christianity, and regards philosophy as a potentially dangerous pursuit (compare Or.162.29-163.8). The Orator is profuse and repetitive in places, e.g with the teleological argument and the exposition of the Fourth Eclogue, and passes over pagan mythology with scarcely a mention. It is difficult to imagine Lactantius having a substantial hand in revising the theology of the Oration; some of his ideas are very different, as the following examples show.

3.3.1: Divine Institutes

3.3.1.1: inst.1.7.13 Lactantius argues that all things have a beginning and therefore God made himself; Or.156.9ff. states that God has no beginning and is above existence.

3.3.1.2: inst.4.2.4f. As Hartmann (1902/20n.23) points out, Lactantius says that Pythagoras and Plato obtained their wisdom from Egypt, the Magi and Persia, and were prevented from getting the truth from the Jews; Or.177.20-3 on the contrary comments that Pythagoras imitated Moses, and that Plato was his disciple.

3.3.1.3: inst.4.10.1 Lactantius states that the Son of God descended to earth ut constitueret deo templum doceretque iustitiam (p.301.9f.), and Or.155.9-10 similarly ἱερόν τινα νεῶν ἀρετῆς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἱδρύσατο -- but the idea is used in a different way. In the Oration it refers to the founding of the church at Pentecost and after, whereas Lactantius sees the foundation of the church as being accomplished by Christ during his earthly ministry.

3.3.1.4: inst.4.26.29-36 Lactantius is concerned to explain why Christ died an ignoble death on a cross. Not only does the Orator not see this as a problem, but also the cross is never mentioned in his text: there is only the circumlocution παθῆμα (154.5,170.14,176.14,19).

3.3.1.5: inst.5.7.4ff. Lactantius maintains that evil exists in order to make virtue evident and faith real; the Orator (Or.170.1f.,172.23-6) attributes evil to passions, and does not explain it philosophically.

3.3.1.6: inst.7.27.2 In this dedication to Constantine, Lactantius draws a distinction between real inner righteousness and the mere

appearance of sanctity; the Orator (Or.189.16-23) knows of no such distinction.

3.3.2: epitome

3.3.2.1: epit.44(49).4f. Lactantius emphasises the unity of Father and Son; the Orator is not explicitly concerned to make this fundamental theological point.

3.3.2.2: epit.63(68).8f. Lactantius allows that Plato upheld the immortality of souls, but says that he taught the transmigration of souls rather than the punishment of the wicked; the Orator (Or.164.6-22) also refers to Plato and immortality, but on the contrary states that Plato did speak of judgement.

3.3.2.3: epit.68(73).2 Lactantius asserts the priority of faith through God's Son, as well as obeying his commands, in order to be saved; the Orator (Or.189.16-23) rather teaches that to live well is sufficient.

3.3.3: de ira dei

3.3.3.1: de ira dei 13.13-18 In the course of explaining why there are evil things in the world, Lactantius says that God put man in a world of good and evil in order to allow the exercise of wisdom. The Orator (Or.172.18ff.) approaches it the other way round, stating that God gave man knowledge of good and evil in order that he might survive in a world where some things were harmful.

3.3.3.2: de ira dei 15.3f. Lactantius blames the existence of evil on the frailty of the flesh, whereas the Orator (Or.172.23-6) blames it on man's choice of passion instead of God's provision.

It is possible then to conclude that there is no literary relationship between the theological writings of Lactantius and the Oration, and moreover that differences of thought between them make a close connection unlikely. Apparent parallels are due to the commonplaces of apologetic rather than direct or indirect contact. If this is true for Lactantius' dogmatic writings, how true is it for his historical tract, the de mortibus persecutorum?

4. DE MORTIBUS PERSECUTORUM

Chapters twenty-four and twenty-five of the Oration proclaim God's judgement on the persecutors of the church, and refer to Decius, Valerian, Aurelian and Diocletian. In mort.pers.4-7 Lactantius writes about the same rulers in the same order, and in his exposition of Diocletian refers to the fire in the palace at Nicomedia, as the Oration does (mort.pers.14;Or.190.29f.). This has led Schultze (1894/542ff.) and Dörries (1954/143n.1) to conclude that the attitudes and contents of the passages are so similar that they show the Orator's dependence on Lactantius; Pfättisch (1908/77) however emphasises the differences, and Heikel (1902/cf.) thought rather that the Oration made a confused use of the v.C. It is difficult to show that general similarities of theme are the result of dependence: the punishment of the persecutors is shown by Heim (1978/57f.) to be included in Constantinian documents in the v.C. (e.g.4.11ff.,2.24,26,2.49-54,1.27), as also in the Divine Institutes (inst.5.24); and themes such as the unchastity of the tyrants also occur in the v.C. (e.g.1.33,55), suggesting that they are common to more Christians than Lactantius and Constantine. It is however possible to look at the treatments of the same historical subjects to discover whether there is any close connection.

4.1: Decius (mort.pers.4/Or.190.4-10)

Dörries (1954/143n.1) states that the Orator is free with his use of the de mortibus persecutorum here, and particularly notes the way in which Decius' defeat was an insult to Rome. It is also notable that Lactantius emphasises Decius' position as an enemy of God, while the Orator stresses the way in which he persecuted the righteous. There is a possible allusion in Or.190.6f. to Decius' lack of burial; but there are no similarities of expression in the passages. The connection between them lies in the way that both deal briefly with Decius and his fall, rather than in evident dependence.

4.2: Valerian (mort.pers.5/Or.190.10-15)

Lactantius goes into much more detail about Valerian than the Orator, but both have a similar train of thought: Valerian persecuted and was judged, and then the judgement is described. There is a difference of detail however: Lactantius describes how Valerian was used by Sapor as a mounting block, but the Orator brings out his humiliation in being led in chains while wearing imperial attire. Constantine refers to Valerian's punishment in general terms in his

letter to Sapor (v.C.4.11) as the result of divine vengeance; and so it seems more likely that the Orator is giving an independent but similar view of Valerian as a persecutor than a precis of Lactantius.

4.3: Aurelian (mort.pers.6/Or.190.15-18)

Compared to Lactantius, the Orator gives a compressed account of Aurelian. There are similar features, such as Aurelian's fierceness, his death in Thrace, and an acknowledgement (explicit in Lactantius, implicit in the Oration) that he had not really begun to persecute the church. But there is a difference in incidental detail regarding his death: it is on the public highway in the Oration, whereas Lactantius emphasises that it was caused by his friends. This difference of detail is again not explained by the hypothesis of the dependence of the Orator upon Lactantius.

4.4: Diocletian

In the de mortibus persecutorum, Lactantius criticises Diocletian's secular as well as religious policies (7,9.11), his timidity as a ruler (9.6f.), the reason why he was a persecutor (10), his illness (17) and his abdication (18f.), as well as the course of events during the persecution. The Orator's treatment of Diocletian is much more restricted: he refers to the persecution and his subsequent mental illness (190.19-22;compare mort.pers.17.9), adding the detail that he lived in a separate house; but after referring to his fear and the palace fire (190.23-30) the Orator pursues a different course to Lactantius by emphasising the certainty of divine retribution, the emperor's unchastity, and the civil war; and the eventual triumph of God is declared. There are similar themes, but no evident dependence. Dörries (1954/153f.,159) points out similar themes elsewhere: the mental suffering of the persecutors (v.C.2.27), civil war (v.C.2.49,54; also Eus.h.e.8.14.3), a long illness (Eus.h.e.8 app.3), and peace before persecution broke out (Or.191.4,compare v.C.2.49). The Orator's treatment is sufficiently different from that of Lactantius to suggest that there is independent thinking rather than a confused use of either Lactantius or Eusebius.

4.5: The palace fire

The fire is mentioned by Lactantius (mort.pers.14.2ff.), Eusebius (h.e.8.6.6) and the Orator (Or.190.29f.). Eusebius states that he did not know the cause, but it had been falsely attributed to the Christ-

ians; Lactantius says that there were two fires, caused by Galerius in order to have a pretext for attacking the Christians; the Orator claims the personal authority of an eyewitness for the cause being lightning. Schultze (1894/544) pointed out that Eusebius' and Lactantius' accounts were in broad agreement, and concluded that the Orator depended on incorrect information; he cannot however explain why, if the Orator is dependent on Lactantius, this detail should have been different. A literary connection is thus unlikely: the question of historicity may perhaps be resolved by the Orator having intended lightning to be a symbol of God's judgement in history, which is encountered elsewhere in the Oration and Constantine (see below VI.8.6).

There thus seem to be no compelling reasons to suppose that the Oration is dependent on the de mortibus persecutorum. Although differences of emphasis are apparent (e.g. Lactantius stresses rebellion against God, but the Orator emphasises damage to the state), it is more important to notice the differences of detail which make any close connection unlikely, despite the similarity of theme. Possibly Lactantius suggested the apologetic value of the deaths of the persecutors to Constantine, and he took it up in his own fashion; but overall there is a similarity of milieu, of ways of thinking, rather than a specific borrowing of one from the other. Themes in the Oration which are also found in Constantinian documents in the v.C. are indications that authorship by Constantine is to be seriously considered; certainly Heikel's thesis that a forger made use of Lactantius' history is unlikely, given that a later forger would have been more likely to follow his sources closely in order to appear more authentic.

5. VIRGIL AND THE SIBYL

If there is no proven literary relationship between Lactantius' writings and the Oration, is it still possible to suggest that Lactantius brought Virgil's Eclogue and the Sibyl to the attention of Constantine, leading to their inclusion in the Oration?

5.1: Lactantius

Lactantius, along with several other apologists, used the witness of the Sibyl to speak to the pagan world, unlike more biblically-

oriented or sceptical authors such as Origen and Eusebius (see Guillamin 1978/193); the oracles of the Sibyl put Christian witness into a classical idiom (so Pichon 1901/211ff.). Lactantius quotes the Sibylline Oracles over seventy times in his extant writings, thirty times in inst.7 (see Kurfess 1936b/11). The selective way in which he uses verses, when contrasted with e.g. Theophilus (Autol.2.3,31,36;compare Ogilvie 1978/28) suggests that he was using a compendium in which the Sibylline verses were associated under headings with other material (so Burch 1927/204ff.;compare Kurfess 1923,Ogilvie 1978/109). Lactantius makes even more use of quotations from Virgil (see index in CSEL 27.2,pp.266ff.); most of these are of the nature of literary allusions, but in inst.7.24.11 he quotes a catena of verses from the Fourth Eclogue which he regards as expounding the prophecies of the Cumaean Sibyl, rather than as independent prophecy regarding Christ (see Fabbri 1930/234;compare Augustine in Pfättisch 1907/736). Lactantius thus shows that a Christian interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue, as found in the Oration, is not a singular occurrence (compare Schwartz 1908/3097). The question here however is whether the way in which Lactantius uses Virgil and the Sibyl is reflected in the Oration.

5.2: Constantine

Nowhere in his known works does Constantine make explicit use of Virgil (so Kraft 1955/272), and he only quotes the Sibylline Oracles in one place, the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.19). It is interesting to note not only the difference between Constantine and the Oration as to how the Sibyl is dated (see below 6.3.1) but also the extremely loose way in which the Sibyl is quoted when compared to our extant version.[2] Opitz (Op.3,p.71) questions Schwartz's view that this is because Constantine is quoting a Latin translation of the Sibylline Oracles; whatever the reason, it is evident that Constantine knew of the Sibylline Oracles and had access to a version of them, at least by 333 on Opitz's dating.

5.3: The Orator

There are several points at which the Orator appears to differ from Lactantius in his use of these authors.

5.3.1: Description of the Sibyl Lactantius (inst.1.6.7-14) reproduces Varro and Fenestella in his description of the Erythraean Sibyl; the Orator (Or.179.8f.) gives a rather different account, similar to that

of Orac.Sib.1.283-90, and closer to the description given by Constantine than that of Lactantius.

5.3.2: Cicero Lactantius (inst.4.15.27) makes general reference to Cicero's knowledge of the Sibyls; the Orator (Or.181.16ff.) states specifically that Cicero knew and translated the acrostic which is quoted. Cicero (div.2.54) says that the Sibylline Oracles were in acrostics, showing their deliberate and non-prophetic nature; he says that they should be shut away, and makes no reference to translating them. Pfättisch (1913a/117) suggests that the Latin text of the Oration has been mistranslated, but gives no reasons or alternatives. It is more likely that the Orator has mis-remembered his knowledge of Cicero in order to bolster his case for the genuineness of the acrostic. It is certain however that Lactantius, a follower of Cicero, would have known that this statement was false; far from being Lactantian in origin, as Kurfess (1936b/14f.) argues, it shows that Lactantius was not connected with the composition or revision of the Oration.

5.3.3: Acrostic verses Lactantius quotes the acrostic verses 8, 23 and 25f. (inst.7.6.11,19.9,20.3) in the same Greek form as they have in the acrostic itself. Mancini (1894/207ff.) concluded that Lactantius would have quoted the acrostic if he could, and therefore it and the Oration were later in date; and Fabbri (1930/235;compare Kurfess 1918a/101;Dölger 1910/59f.) held that the scattered use of the verses showed that Lactantius did not know the acrostic. Guillamin (1978/197ff.) even suggested that Lactantius introduced the Sibyl to Constantine, and his interest led to a new edition including the acrostic. On the other hand, the acrostic form may have been missed if the last strophe was not an integral part of it (compare Dölger 1910/59f.); and Lactantius could have used the acrostic to his advantage in order to testify to Christ, e.g. at inst.1.6 or 4.6.7. The acrostic is discussed further below (6.2); here the significance is that Lactantius was concerned with the content of the Sibylline verses, not with their form as the Orator was. They also have a different approach to the verses (compare Heikel 1902/xcvii): the Orator applies them to Christ's first coming, and Lactantius to his second coming. There is thus no particular connection; as Bolhuis (1956/30f.) observes, the Sibylline Oracles were so widespread that three quotations of the same material cannot automatically imply dependence.

5.3.4: Erythraean Sibyl quotation (Or.187.1-4) Pfättisch (1908/45f.) suggested that this reference to the Erythraean Sibyl in the midst of an exposition of Virgil, who refers to the Cumaean Sibyl, was interpolated by a translator oriented towards the Erythraean Sibyl. Kurfess (1952/46) argued that the way in which Lactantius combined different Sibylline books in one quotation suggested to the Orator that any Christian quotations from the Sibyls were taken from the Erythraean. He does however make reference to other authors who combined different Sibyls,[3] and therefore this 'confusion' is not specific to Lactantius; it is also possible that the Orator was using a compendium which already attributed the quotation to the Erythraean Sibyl. The quotation is not found in our present Sibylline Oracles (see below 6.2).

5.3.5: Virgil Lactantius uses mainly the Aeneid for his quotations, and only uses the Fourth Eclogue in inst.7.24.11. The Orator on the other hand quotes only the Eclogue, and apart from Virgil and the Sibyl contains no explicit literary allusions. It is possible that Lactantius could have emphasised the Christian interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue and caught Constantine's imagination, but the way in which the Eclogue is interpreted chiliastically by Lactantius, and relating to Christ's first coming by the Orator, makes this unlikely (compare Fabbri 1930/235 and Decker 1978/88, as against Kurfess 1936b/12). If the Orator was dependent on Lactantius, why did he not make more use of Virgil? And why are helpful biblical, Sibylline or Hermetic passages not put to his apologetic use? As with the Sibylline acrostic, so with Virgil: the fact that Lactantius quotes a few verses from material given in full in the Oration, and used these in a different way, suggests independence of thought between Lactantius and the Orator, and not that one drew on the other for choice of material.

This conclusion makes the Constantinian authorship of the Oration easier to contemplate. If Constantine was not in the habit of making quotations, then the use of three specific passages in the Oration does not invalidate authorship by him, since they involve particular passages which Constantine considered significant, not a change of style towards a more rhetorically polished use of literary allusions (see below VI.9.2). The loose quotation of the Sibyl in the letter to Arius is analogous to the loose allusion to the Erythraean Sibyl in the Oration. The acrostic and the Fourth Eclogue however had to be rendered exactly in order to keep the form of one and the well known

words of the other. Any connections between the Oration and the works of Lactantius regarding Virgil and the Sibyl can be explained better by similarity of context than by direct dependence.

6. THE ORATION AND THE SIBYL

If the Oration is not dependent on Lactantius, what is its relationship with the Sibylline Oracles? There are three particular areas to consider: particular parallels of material; the acrostic; and the history of the Sibyl.

6.1: The Sibyl as a source

The Sibylline Oracles are quoted by several early Christian writers, as well as being referred to more generally.[4] The only quotation in the Oration apart from the acrostic, of the Erythraean Sibyl (187.2ff.), is not found in extant Sibylline literature in this form: Pfättisch (1908/113) suggested that it was drawn from Orac.Sib.8.195ff. even though the contents are different; Kurfess (1936b/18-21) suggested Orac.Sib.3.1-8,296ff.,371f. as possible sources, showing the vagueness of the parallel. Either this represents a lost passage; or it is a prose precis of a Sibylline saying, which the author composed himself or found in a compendium; or it may have been a Latin prose version of the Sibyl which has been translated back into Greek, making it unrecognisable -- as may have happened with Constantine and the Sibyl (see above 5.2). There have however been two attempts to argue that the Oration shows dependence on words or statements found in the Sibylline Oracles.

6.1.1: Pfättisch

Pfättisch (1908/112f.) suggested that the translation of the Fourth Eclogue showed traces of the Sibylline Oracles: the phrases he suggested are however more likely to have been drawn by the translator and the author of the Sibylline Oracles from the common classical literary tradition. He goes on to propose that the indistinct nature of the scriptural references in the Oration is accounted for if they are seen as dependent on material in the Sibylline Oracles, and gives three examples.

6.1.1.1: Orac.Sib.1.41,8.262/Or.158.22,172.19

In their references to the knowledge of good and evil, the Orator and the Sibylline author

show some similarity, but the Sibylline material is close to and drawn from Genesis 3, whereas the Oration shows a marked divergence from it.

6.1.1.2: Orac.Sib.1.351ff.,8.273ff./Or.169.10-14,174.16-175.22 Both authors deal with the miracles of Jesus. Kurfess (1936b/22) suggested that the lists in the Oration were drawn from scripture, and that in any case Orac.Sib.8.205ff. was a better parallel than those quoted by Pfättisch. There are no exact parallels of material, and various lists of miracles drawn from the New Testament are common enough in Christian literature; passages such as Orac.Sib.6.13ff. show that they were widespread, and thus do not imply dependence.

6.1.1.3: Orac.Sib.1.285/Or.183.23 The word πρωτόπλαστος is used in both places, which led Kurfess (1936b/22) to conclude that Constantine knew the first book of the Sibylline Oracles. However, the context in the Sibylline Oracles is that of peace after the Deluge, not the Fall as in the Oration; and the use of a single word cannot be used to prove dependence when it stands in such isolation.

6.1.2: Kurfess Kurfess (1952/48-54) put forward eight possible parallels between the Oracles and the Oration.

6.1.2.1: Theoph.Autol.2.3/Or.157.22 These comments on the multiplicity of gods are definitely parallel thoughts;[5] but this does not explain the relationship between them. Was there a direct borrowing? If so, was it from Theophilus or the Oracles? Or was it a common argument, used independently by the Orator? There is no verbal similarity to indicate any particular dependence.

6.1.2.2: Orac.Sib.1.41/Or.158.16-22 Both passages are dealing with the creation of man; Kurfess regards the use of ἀγαθός/κακός in both places, instead of the LXX καλός/πονηρός, as implying dependence. He undermines his case however by explaining that the words are singular in the Oracles and plural in the Oration because in the latter case they are translated from the Latin: meaning that they were chosen by the translator, rather than being the Orator's own allusion to the Sibylline Oracles.

6.1.2.3: Orac.Sib.1.351-9/Or.169.10-14 Kurfess here accepted the parallel proposed by Pfättisch for the lists of miracles, but did not answer the objection raised above (6.1.1.2).

6.1.2.4: Orac.Sib.8.205ff.,273f./Or.170.5-9 This is again only a general list of miracles with no specific indication of dependence.

6.1.2.5: Orac.Sib.1.372-5/Or.170.13 Any connection between these statements on the time of the passion is due to a common source in

scripture. If the Oracles had included a reference to chaos or the renewal of heaven, as the Oration does, then some kind of dependence would have appeared more likely.

6.1.2.6: Orac.Sib.6.9-14/Or.ch.15 Both passages are describing the life of Jesus: they are bound to have similarities, since the sixth book of the Oracles gives an account of the life of Jesus. There are no evident verbal links, and a definite common source.

6.1.2.7: Orac.Sib.6.1-7/Or.168.22-169.2 The similarity here lies in the way that the two authors associate the birth and baptism of Jesus: but the same criticism of a common source in scripture applies to this suggestion too.

6.1.2.8: Or.175.4-11 Kurfess suggests a number of parallels from the Oracles for this passage on the life of Jesus; the way in which he can find a large number of possibilities is in itself an indication of the weakness of his case.

Apart from these two authors, Bolhuis (1956/28) suggested that Orac.Sib.3.11-28 formed one source for the Oration, in order to show the loose way in which the Orator uses his sources. It is however hardly necessary to find a specific source for the Orator's theme of God's greatness and power; the fact that there is no trace of the mystic use of Adam's name (Orac.Sib.3.24ff.) rules this out as a parallel.

The repetitive nature of the Sibylline Oracles makes it difficult to attribute any dependence with certainty in the absence of convincing verbal links. The only other apparent close similarity is in Theoph. Autol.2.36 (frag.3,p.90.2): εἰ δὲ γενητὸν ὅλως καὶ φθείρεται, compared to the Orator's τὰ δ' ἐκ γενέσεως φθαρτὰ πάντα (Or.157.19), which appears to be a widespread idea rather than an exact quotation. Attempts to show that the Oration shows any dependence on the Sibylline Oracles prove only that there is a common source for both in Christian tradition.

6.2: The Sibylline acrostic

The fact that Orac.Sib.8.217-50 is quoted verbatim in the Oration (179.19-181.2) raises three issues.

6.2.1: Dating What implications does the use of the acrostic have for the date of the Oration? Mancini (1894/226f.) argued that because Augustine quoted it (civ.dei 18.23) without the last strophe, it was shown to be a forgery of the fifth century. Rauschen (1910/69) dis-

agreed, and Wendland (1902/232) proposed that there was more than one edition of the Sibyl. Pfättisch (1908/17f.;compare Kurfess 1918a/105) pointed out that Augustine's Latin tradition was different from the Orator's Greek version, and Dölger (1910/59) said that Augustine's testimony showed that the acrostic predated him. Hanson (1973/507) concluded that it was impossible to use the acrostic to date the Oration because it is unknown when the σταυρός strophe was included, and that the acrostic may anyway have circulated independently before its inclusion in Orac.Sib.8. Dölger's enquiry (1910/61ff.) into the date of the acrostic itself however suggested that from internal evidence it dates from the end of the second century, and therefore that it was composed long before the Oration, as against Guillamin (see above 5.3.3). The Orator used an existing acrostic which was composed as a prophecy of Christ: Dölger (1910/66) was wrong to see it in terms of safeguarding the contents from corruption, since it was not so much the content as the form that chiefly interested the Christians.[6]

6.2.2: Form The question of the relationship of the last strophe to the rest of the acrostic concerns both the dating and the form of the Oration. If the broad consensus that there were two versions of the acrostic is correct, how did this extra strophe arise? The facts that it makes particular allusion to the acrostic form, refers to specifically Christian symbols unlike the rest of the acrostic, and is outside the ΙΧΘΥΣ structure of the other strophes, all suggest that it was a later addition to an existing acrostic rather than an integral part of it. Augustine's old Latin translation would have picked up the acrostic if the verses at the end had been included, even if Lactantius knew it but chose not to use it. Was the last strophe added by the translator or author of the Oration? Kurfess (1918a/100) thought that the σταυρός strophe was added by the translator because of the Good Friday theme, and made two attempts to pin down his sources: at first (1936b/25) he suggested Orac.Sib.8.195-202, but the unconvincing nature of the parallel led to his later view (1950/149) that Constantine himself composed the strophe (in Latin?) on the basis of Cicero's reference to a king in div.2.54, leading to the reference (Orac.Sib.8. 250/Or.181.2) to Σωτὴρ ἀθάνατος βασιλεύς. The context however makes this unlikely, because Cicero is concerned with the way in which the Sibylline Oracles were being used to argue for a king in Rome, rather than expounding their content; and in any case this only accounts for one line out of seven.

There are two reasons for supposing that the last strophe was already in the copy of the acrostic used by the Orator. First, their purpose is to call attention to the Christian nature of the acrostic; but this is already done in the context of the Oration, rendering the final verses unnecessary. Second, the implication of the comments which commence the next chapter (Or.181.6-12) is that the acrostic was already known to be a source of controversy (compare Mancini 1894/208f.), suggesting that it was included in the Oration as a given piece rather than a revised form. We cannot know whether the Orator used the Sibylline books or had a separate MS for the acrostic, but the implication is that there was a separate tradition of the acrostic based on the form IXΘΥΣ which understandably left out the last strophe, and which is represented in the manuscript of Augustine's friend Flaccianus.

6.2.3: Context The Orator quoted the acrostic because he believed that their form proved them to be genuine (compare Cicero div.2.54;Dionysius Arch.4.62.6), and that the acrostic was a prophecy of Christ's coming. Heikel (1902/xcvii;1911/28) mistakenly concentrated on the inappropriate content of the acrostic, which concerns judgement rather than Christ (compare Pfättisch 1913a/116), but held (1911/30) that the use of κρίσις in the next chapter (Or.181.14) to refer to Christ was loosely drawn from the acrostic verses 179.19,21,24; if the latter is correct, then it ties the verses even closer into their context, and it would not have been odd if a translator had used an item of vocabulary from the Sibylline prophecy. The comments on the contents of the acrostic (Or.181.10ff.) do not show that the contents of the acrostic were after all important, but that the author was aware of the level of argument about it: Christians maintained that the contents were Sibylline and thus valuable, and the incidental acrostic form was therefore due to the inspiration of God, while the pagans held that the acrostic form proved it was a forgery. Kurfess (1918a/100) concluded that Augustine's testimony showed that the old Latin translation of the acrostic knew its contents but not its form, and therefore that the Greek verses were added by the translator. The difficulty with this view is that the verses are closely connected with their context: the introduction (Or.179.14-18) is meaningless if the acrostic is not quoted, since otherwise τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κατελεύσεως (179.18) is not indicated at all, and the following ταῦτα (181.3,9) have no referent. Whether the verses were quoted in Latin or Greek in the

original draft of the Oration depends partly on whether Augustine's Latin translation was the only one; but they were probably in Greek in an otherwise Latin draft (compare Barnes 1981/75), since: Constantine and other educated Latins knew Greek; the reference to Cicero's Latin translation (Or.18l.16ff.) implies that the acrostic is not quoted in Latin, or else there would have been an explanation of how the form given related to that of Cicero; and the Sibyl was a Greek book, so that quoting the original would carry more weight than a secondhand Latin translation. Certainly an assessment of the acrostic gives no reason to suppose either that the Orator drew after all on the Sibylline books in general, or that he cannot be identified with Constantine.

6.3: The history of the Sibyl

Finally there are two issues associated with the Orator's introduction to the acrostic (Or.179.8-18): the time at which the Sibyl lived, and how her history relates to Daphne.

6.3.1: Dating As far as the historical view of the Erythraean Sibyl is concerned, Eusebius' Chronicle (see Guillamin 1978/193f.) places her around 742 B.C., 440 years after Troy; Augustine (civ.dei 18.23) indirectly supports this by stating that some people thought she lived around the time of Troy rather than that of Romulus. The legendary tradition of her origins found in the Oration (179.8f.) states that she lived ἕκτῃ γενεᾷ μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμόν, whereas Constantine (to Arius,Op.3,34.18) says that she prophesied 3000 years ago; and the Sibylline Oracles themselves say that the Sibyl was the daughter-in-law of Noah in the sixth generation after Adam (Orac.Sib.1.283-90,compare 3.823-9). How are these different legendary versions of the Sibyl's dating to be explained? Heikel (1911/28f.) thought that the Orator had made a clumsy error in putting the Sibyl in the sixth generation after the Flood, instead of after Adam; Pfättisch (1908/113) regarded γενεᾷ as 'parataktisch' for 'era' (i.e.,'in the sixth era, the one just after the Flood'), and explained Constantine's statement by pointing out that customary reckoning put the Flood 3000 years before his time.

Theophilus (Autol.3.24,28) sought to show that the Flood took place 3453 years previously, and that the sixth generation after the Flood came some 700 years later, i.e. about 2900 years before Constantine. If Constantine's πρὸ τρισχιλίων που ἐτῶν refers to the later date, then Constantine and the Orator share the same error, and could be identical: either Constantine mis-remembered the original Sibylline

Oracle, or else he was using an inaccurate source of reference. If however Constantine indicates the time of the Flood, the earlier date, then in preference to Pfättisch[7] the statement in the Oration is to be explained by a mistranslation using a wrong preposition: the Orator originally said that the Sibyl lived in the sixth generation at the time of the Flood. Either way, it is not necessary to assume that the Orator was making an essentially different statement from that of Constantine; nor is it necessary to assume that he was using the Sibylline Oracles as a source, since he could well have drawn on a historical summary prepared by someone else.

6.3.2: Daphne Stiglmayr (1909/351n.2) castigated the Orator for his poor use of sources in describing the Erythraean Sibyl with features which belonged to the Pythic oracle at Delphi, and then linking this historical person with the mythological nymph Daphne. Guillamin (1978/196n.58) also found it puzzling that ἄδυτα (179.14) should be used of the Sibyl when it was a Delphic term. Kurfess (1936b/21n.3) however pointed to the tradition in Pausanias (Description 10.12.1ff.) that the Erythraean Sibyl was found at Delphi; the author has not assimilated the Sibyl into Delphic tradition without a precedent. Regarding Daphne, Pfättisch (1913b/247n.3) identified the reference as being to the oracle of Apollo near Antioch; Hanson (1973/507-11) used this identification to argue that the Oration must date from that Oracle's revival under Julian, having gone to great pains to show that it was actually functioning then; and Barnes (1976a/416) answered this by suggesting that the shrine at Daphne produced anti-Christian oracles shortly before 311. All these authors are however mistaken in identifying Daphne with a place: as Kurfess (1949/169n.7) points out, the Orator refers to the daughter of Teiresias, a tradition represented in Diodorus Siculus (History 4.66.5f.), where Daphne is said to have been dedicated to Delphi and produced oracles such that she was called Sibylla. Although Diodorus himself is not the source for the Orator's comments, since Daphne's parents play no part in his account of her dedication, and there is no mention of ἀσχήμονες θυμοί (Or.179.13), a similar tradition must lie behind this statement; the Orator's point is that the Sibyl's service of the Pythic oracle produced nothing good, 'according to the same things as are narrated concerning Daphne' (179.13f.;compare LS art.αὐτός III.2), referring to a comparable Sibylline priestess and not a shrine. The detail that the Sibyl was devoted out of the folly of her parents (Or.179.12) suggests that the

Orator, or more likely his source, has developed the tradition of the Sibyl beyond what is found in the Sibylline Oracles themselves, which supports the view that the Orator was depending on a compendium of history and apologetic rather than a direct use of the Sibylline Oracles.

7. CONCLUSION

There are two main conclusions to be drawn from this assessment of Lactantius and the Sibyl with regard to the Oration. The first is that the relationship between Lactantius, the Sibylline Oracles and the Oration is unclear, but there is no solid evidence to show that the Orator is in any way dependent on them; rather, the links between them argue for a similar context in the Christian world of the third and early fourth centuries (so Harnack 1904/117;Decker 1978/81ff.). The conclusions of scholars who have tried to make this relationship more definite have largely been determined by their presuppositions (see above 1.2,4).

The second conclusion is that the case for Constantinian authorship of the Oration, while not proven, is strengthened: the distance between Lactantius' and Constantine's lives and thought is similar to that between Lactantius and the Orator; there are links between the Oration and Constantinian documents; neither the Orator nor Constantine make much use of quotations, and where they do quote the Sibyl (other than in the acrostic) they have a similar loose rendering; the views of Constantine and the Orator on the dating of the Sibyl can be harmonised. Either Constantine and the Orator rely on similar sources, which are neither Lactantius nor the Sibylline Oracles, or they have similarly idiosyncratic memories. Before analysing the relationship between Constantine and the Orator in depth, it is necessary to put the Oration into context as an apologetic work and to compare it with the works of Constantine's other prolific ecclesiastical admirer Eusebius.

CHAPTER IV - EUSEBIUS AND THE APOLOGISTS

BOOKLIST

Barnes,T.D. 'Two Speeches by Eusebius', Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, 18 (1977) 341-5.

--- Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

--- The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine (London, 1982).

Baynes,N.H. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church (London, 1931).

Bolhuis,A. 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen und Lactantius Divinae Institutiones', Vigiliae Christianae, 10 (1956) 25-32.

Bureth,P. Les Titulatures Impériales dans les Papyrus, les Ostraca et les Inscriptions d'Égypte (30 a.c.-284 p.c.) (Brussels, 1964).

Crafer,T.W. The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes (London,1919).

Dillon,J. The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220 (London,1977).

Drake,H. In Praise of Constantine (London,1976).

Grant,R.M. Theophilus of Antioch: Ad Autolycum (Oxford,1970).

--- Eusebius as Church Historian (Oxford,1980).

Grillmeier,A. Christ in Christian Tradition, second edition, vol.1 (London,1975).

Hanson,R.P.C. 'The "Oratio ad Sanctos" attributed to the Emperor Constantine and the oracle at Daphne', Journal of Theological Studies, 24 (1973) 505-11.

Harnack,A. 'Die Bezeichnung Jesus als "Knecht Gottes" und ihre Geschichte in der alten Kirche', Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 28 (1926) 212-38.

Hartmann,W. Konstantin der Grosse als Christ und Philosoph in seinen Briefen und Erlassen, Beilage zum Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde (Fürstenwalde,1902).

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius 1, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Jeremias,J. 'παῖς θεοῦ', in ed. Kittel,G. and Friedrich,G., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, translated by G.W. Bromiley, 10 vols (Grand Rapids,1964-76) V (1967) pp.654-717.

Kurfess,A. 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 130 (1950) 145-65.

Mancini,A. 'La Pretesa Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum', Studi Storici, 3 (1894) 92-117,207-28.

Michel,O. 'υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ', in ed. Brown,C., The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols (Exeter,1975-8) III (1978) pp.634-48.

Mras,K. Eusebius Werke 8.1, GCS 43.1 (Berlin,1954).

Nock,A.D. Conversion. The old and the new in religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo (Oxford,1933).

Norden,E. Die Geburt des Kindes: Geschichte einer religiösen Idee (Leipzig,1924).

Ogilvie,R.M. The Library of Lactantius (Oxford,1978).

Pfättisch,J.M. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

--- 'Platos Einfluss auf die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 92 (1910) 399-417.

--- 'Die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', in ed. Dölger,F.J., Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, Supplementheft der Römischen Quartalschrift, 19 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1913a) pp.96-121.

Rossignol,J.P. Virgile et Constantin le Grand (Paris,1845).

Schultze,V. 'Quellenuntersuchungen zur Vita Constantini des Eusebius', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 14 (1894) 503-55.

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 29 (1908) 3096-9.

Wallace-Hadrill,D. Eusebius of Caesarea (London,1960).

Wendland,P. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen: Eusebius Werke 1, hrsg. von I. Heikel, usw.', Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift, 22 (1902) 225-36.

1. INTRODUCTION

Discussions about the authorship and date of the Oration revolve in part around different interpretations of its relationship to other literary sources. Its relationship to the works of Lactantius has already been assessed, and the following chapters compare it with the works of Plato and Constantine. This chapter is concerned with the relationship between the Oration and the works of Eusebius, and also how the Oration fits into the context of pre-Nicene apologetic. These two areas of study are considered together, partly because they both are concerned primarily with how the Oration relates to Greek theological writing, and also because they both shed light on the way in which παῖς is used of Christ in the Oration, a study of which concludes the chapter. Beginning with Eusebius, there are two ways of considering his relationship to the Oration and its author.

1.1: Historical

It has been observed by Barnes (1981/265ff.,especially n.66) that the received picture of Eusebius as a close confidant of Constantine is erroneous. Eusebius saw Constantine once before Nicaea, from a distance in Palestine;[1] we know that they met four times after that, but only in the context of meetings and councils, and not as far as we know privately (Barnes 1981/266). None of the letters which Eusebius cites as being written to him by Constantine show the marks of a close relationship.[2] As Barnes says (1981/104), Eusebius did not become a subject of Constantine until he was over sixty and had written his major works; those writers who hold to the Constantinian authorship of the Oration, with one exception (Schwartz 1908/3099), place its composition before Nicaea, making Eusebius' personal influence on the content of the Oration extremely unlikely. Their later contact, including Eusebius' visits to the palace, would however have enabled Eusebius to discover enough about Constantine to make the statements in the v.C. (4.29,32) about the emperor and his orations reasonably trustworthy. The historical data give no grounds for supposing that Constantine's biographer had any particular influence on his thought. We cannot know whether Constantine read any of Eusebius' major theological works: the implication of v.C.4.35, that Constantine preferred to read his theology in Latin, would make it unlikely, and in fact no one has attempted to argue this directly in the way that they have for Lactantius. All we know is that Constantine heard Eusebius speak on the Holy Sepulchre and at his Tricennalia (v.C.4.33,35,46), and that he

said that he had read the bishop's tract on Easter in translation: that does not mean that Constantine drew on Eusebius' theology, or even that he remembered what the bishop had said.

1.2: Literary

The literary connection between the works of Eusebius and the Oration has been considered from four different viewpoints.

1.2.1: Eusebius as author Could Eusebius have written the Oration? Rossignol (1845/vif.) argued that Constantine could not have produced the Oration because of its historical errors, Platonisms, and close connections with Lactantius, and therefore that Eusebius wrote it: he promised (1845/351) to prove it in another book, but never did. Mancini (1894/103-16), supported by Heikel (1902/xcviiif.), compared the Oration to Eusebius' works in order to show that Eusebius could not in fact have written the Oration: Eusebius would not have used a Latin Eclogue, and quotes neither Virgil nor the Sibyl; he would have used the Bible more, and been more literal where it is used; there are differences of history (e.g. the palace burning at Nicomedia, Or.190. 24-30/h.e.8.6.6), and different styles and vocabulary. These arguments have won general acceptance (compare Hanson 1973/506). The debate about translation has implications for whether Eusebius could have been connected with the Oration: thus Schultze (1894/551) sees the Oration as having been heavily reworked in the process of translation, and wonders whether Eusebius was responsible for the revision; while Hartmann (1902/33) excludes Eusebius from having any connection with the Oration because of the literal nature of the translation.

1.2.2: A Eusebian forger If Eusebius did not write the Oration, it is possible to argue that a later author made his forgery while drawing on Eusebius' writings. Although Wendland (1902/229f.) pointed out how easy it could have been for Eusebius simply to annex the Oration to the v.C., other scholars disagreed, and held the Oration to be a forgery based on Eusebius' comments in the v.C. (4.29,32). Mancini (1894/210-24) thought that Lactantius was the main source along with Constantine's letters, but suggested four links between the Oration and the laus, and one parallel with the preparatio evangelica. Heikel (1902/cf.;1911/45f.) saw Eusebius as one of the main sources of the Oration, and suggested nine close parallels between chapter twenty-five of the Oration and the v.C., as well as comparisons with the laus and historia ecclesiastica. Pfättisch (1908/19) disagreed, maintaining

that there were no conceptual or literal parallels between Eusebius' works and the Oration, and that v.C.4.29 represented only the common apologetic thinking of the time. As Baynes says (1931/53), the forgery argument is generally discredited, although it has been implicitly revived by Hanson (1973); and the suggested parallels still need to be evaluated to see whether there is any evident influence by Eusebius on the text of the Oration.

1.2.3: Eusebius as source Schwartz (1908/3098) said that Constantine's source for the references to Plato in the Oration must have been the Plato of his time, as represented in Eusebius' preparatio evangelica and theophania. Pfättisch (1910/415f.) disagreed with Schwartz's conclusion, while admitting that the Oration showed traces of the Middle Platonism of its time, as Eusebius did (compare Barnes 1981/74, 93f.).

1.2.4: Similarity of context Pfättisch (1910/401) held that any similarities were due to a common milieu rather than direct dependence, because of his view that the Constantinian core of the Oration had been reworked by a Platonist, and was not dependent in any way upon Eusebius.

In order to assess the literary relationship between Eusebius and the Oration, it is necessary to assess particular suggested parallels and then to consider more general points of comparison.

2. EUSEBIUS: SPECIFIC PARALLELS

2.1: Vita Constantini

2.1.1: v.C.4.29 Heikel (1902/xcix) suggested that the Oration was forged on the basis of Eusebius' description of Constantine's orations given in the v.C., while Pfättisch (1908/19) denied it. There are two questions here: could a forger have used this passage as a basis for the Oration? And could Eusebius have taken his precis of the contents of Constantine's orations from the Oration alone, or does it imply that he knew of other imperial orations?

Eusebius states that Constantine began by showing the error of polytheism and its nature as impious fraud; then asserted God's sole lordship and the extent of his providence; discussed the economy of

salvation; and concluded with a powerful exposition of divine judgment, applied particularly to his hearers. Elements of this pattern occur in the Oration, but in a different order, and much other material is included. Thus chapter three deals with God's sole lordship; chapter four with paganism as an immoral delusion; chapters five to eight with providence; chapter nine with philosophy, and chapter ten with the falsehood of poetic mythology. When compared with other Christian apologetic[3] there is little space given to attacking paganism, and much to the assertion of providence. Following Eusebius' plan again, chapters eleven to fifteen deal with God's plan of salvation, but chapters sixteen to twenty-one offer the support of prophetic and pagan witnesses to the Incarnation, which is not mentioned by Eusebius; and chapters twenty-two to twenty-five are concerned to show the invincibility of piety in the history of the church, and touch on God's judgment only in so far as they treat of the deaths of the persecutors. Nowhere in the Oration does the theme of divine judgment on the greedy and those in authority occur, and references to God's judgment (164.20ff.,173.1-7,190.2f.) are in passing, rather than being expositions of τὴν περὶ τοῦ θείου δικαιωτηρίου διδασκαλίαν (v.C.4.29.3, p.131.16).

Therefore v.C.4.29 has not been the basis for the forging of the Oration; nor is it a precis of that work. It represents a coherent apologetic pattern which Constantine may have followed on other occasions, but not in the Oration. Perhaps the gap between v.C.4.29 and the promise in 4.32 to annex one of Constantine's orations was partly intended to distance the contents of the work Eusebius possessed from Constantine's normal apologetic; if 4.32 had followed directly on 4.29, then Eusebius' failure to annex an oration which followed his stated model would have been more glaringly obvious.

2.1.2: Parallels Heikel (1902/cf.;partly reiterated in 1911/45f.) put forward nine correspondences between the v.C. and chapter twenty-five of the Oration, although he felt that none of them were strong enough to be included in the textual apparatus. His intention was to show that a forger had used the v.C., but rather loosely, explaining the apparent historical confusions in chapter twenty-five -- an argument which may say very little, since a loose connection may be no connection at all. How close are the parallels he attests?

2.1.2.1: Or.191.2f./v.C.1.51 As with all these passages, these comments about unprovoked attack on the Christians have no verbal links, but only a similarity of theme. Apart from the differences of context (Diocletian in the Oration, Licinius in the v.C.), the theme is a natural one for Christians to maintain, i.e. that they had done nothing which deserved persecution. A common argument does not show dependence.

2.1.2.2: Or.191.4/v.C.1.49 Prosperity is said to have reigned before the persecutions began. Again, this is an obvious enough point: God gave the Empire peace while his church was left alone, so why was its peace disturbed?

2.1.2.3: Or.191.9f./v.C.1.58,2.1 The cruelty of tyranny was unprecedented. The fact that this describes the activities of Diocletian, Maximin and Licinius indicates that it was a normal charge against tyrants, and does not show that the Orator was dependent for the idea on Eusebius.

2.1.2.4: Or.191.12ff./v.C.1.33,55 The unchastity of tyrants is again a common theme; but note that the Orator, unlike Eusebius, stresses the depredations of the emperor against Christian women, rather than women in general.

2.1.2.5: Or.191.19-24/v.C.1.35 The tyrants' subjects are slain by their fellow citizens. In the Oration this is a direct reference to the persecutions, whilst in the v.C. it is used of a single massacre of the Romans by Maxentius' bodyguard.

2.1.2.6: Or.191.25f./v.C.1.33 The vocabulary, style and context of these descriptions of Maxentius as an usurper are all different. This reads like a standard accusation of propaganda rather than a dependent phrase or idea.

2.1.2.7: Or.191.26f./v.C.1.38 The providence of God was evident in freeing Rome. Eusebius makes much more of the theme of providence at Constantine's victory than does the Orator, who includes it as an interjection leading on to a reference to providence in nature (191.27-192.1). In contrast, the v.C. is full of biblical quotations, and Eusebius refers to God's specific providence to Constantine rather than the Orator's more general theme of providence to the oppressed.

2.1.2.8: Or.191.27/v.C.2.6,12 The army of the tyrant was destroyed in several successive battles. Eusebius refers to Licinius, while the Orator is unclear in his historical reference (but see below VII.3.3); there is also however a similarity to Eus.h.e.9.9.3, suggesting that

the Oration contains a general historical allusion rather than a particular literary parallel.
2.1.2.9: Or.191.27-192.6/v.C.2.19 Thanksgiving is offered after the defeat of the tyrant. In the Oration this is in the context of expressing the relationship of God's providence to nature and politics; in the v.C. there is a rather different setting, where the personal triumphs of Constantine under God are praised, and hope is expressed for the future.

Thus Heikel is incorrect to assert that the Orator used the v.C. as the source for his different themes. The simmilarities in the two works, particularly in ideas about the rule of tyrants and their persecutions, can be accounted for by there having been a common stock of ideas about tyrants on which they both drew; it does not show any literary relationship.

2.2: De laudibus Constantini

Mancini (1894/223), supported in one instance by Heikel (1902/ci), suggested four parallels between the laus and the Oration in support of his thesis of concious forgery.

2.2.1: Or.154.9-155.20/laus 13.9-16 The passages are concerned with the chaos of human life without providence, and the order brought by Christ. The Orator emphasises man's apostasy from God before and after Christ's coming to earth, while Eusebius goes into much more detail about man's fallen state, and how the Incarnation related to the activity of the pre-existent Logos. Although there are similar thoughts, there are no verbal links; the nearest correspondence in Eusebius is laus 13.12, where the world is attributed to nature: ἀλόγῳ δὲ καὶ αὐτομάτῳ φύσει εἱμαρμένης τε ἀνάγκῃ (p.240.13). Eusebius uses φύσις in a different way from the Orator (Or.154.9-13) to mean the self-existent and irrational source of the world, rather than the Orator's idea of order under God; and the Orator has an extensive discussion of the key words αὐτόματον and εἱμαρμένη in chapter six, whereas Eusebius does not elaborate at all. There is then a general similarity of thought, without any evident or necessary dependence.
2.2.2: Or.166.19-26/laus pro.1 Both authors disclaim in rhetorical fashion the utterance of mere words in preference to truth. That is the only similarity: the Orator appeals to Christ for aid and says in plain words that truth and not rhetoric is the author's concern, while

Eusebius says that the speaker will forgo idle tales with no content, but does not forswear oratory. The similarity is of convention, not substance.

2.2.3: Or.160.12-161.18/laus 1.4f. Nature testifies to God's providence. This is such a common theme of apologetic literature (see below 4.2.3) that only some striking common feature could show dependence of one passage upon the other -- and there is none. The theme is similar, but the words and sentiments differ.

2.2.4: Or.156.26-157.4/laus 3.6 There is only one God. Eusebius begins with Constantine and goes on to extol the virtues of monarchy, shown as the best system of government because of the μοναρχία of God; he draws a picture of the heavenly kingdom under God. The Orator however is arguing for the necessity of one God, as against polytheism, so that there might be right worship.

The suggested parallels between the laus and the Oration thus argue, as with the v.C., for a similar context and convention, and not for any literary dependence.

2.3: Historia ecclesiastica

As well as suggesting that chapter twenty-five of the Oration was dependent on the v.C., Heikel (1911/45f.) also added three references where the historia ecclesiastica could have been a possible source for the chapter.

2.3.1: Or.191.3/h.e.10.8.8 Eusebius refers to Licinius attacking the pious without provocation, whereas the Orator makes this charge against Diocletian; and the theme, as already noted, is unexceptional.

2.3.2: Or.191.25/h.e.8.13.15,8.14.1 These apparently refer to the usurpation of authority by Maximin, and Maxentius' rule at Rome. The context and vocabulary is even more different here than with the supposed parallel in the v.C., and no connection is apparent.

2.3.3: Or.191.29/h.e.10.9.7 Both authors rejoice in victory. There is a similar movement in the two texts from fear to thanksgiving: but in Eusebius it is directed to Constantine as well as God, whilst the Orator emphasises God's providence. Both read as conventional propaganda, but are not related to one another.

2.4: Preparatio evangelica

2.4.1: Fate Mancini (1894/223) and Wendland (1902/230) both noted the similarity between the Orator's discussion of the Stoic εἱμαρμένη in chapter six (especially 159.7-160.18) and Eusebius' treatment of the subject in p.e.6.6. There are certainly similar arguments: thus p.e.6.6.5 is similar to the Oration (159.17-26) in saying that fate and necessity mean an end to religion, philosophy and virtue, with no blame then possible for evil (6.6.18), a paralysis of human initiative (6.6.8-17), and laws being made irrelevant (6.6.18, compare Or.159.26-31). Eusebius goes on to say that we know free will in our psychological experience (6.6.20f.), as against the Orator's stress on moral consequences (159.31-160.3); but Eusebius then turns, as does the Orator, to emphasise providence (6.6.23). What follows is rather different from the arguments in the Oration, although the view that evil comes from the soul walking not κατὰ φύσιν but παρὰ φύσιν (6.6.47, p.307.19,22f.) resembles the terminology of Or.154.12f., which is not however concerned with evil in the abstract, but with man's rebellion against God. Eusebius denies (6.6.53ff.) that fate could be interpreted as a way of speaking about the God of providence, because of the implications for free will; whereas the Orator (159.18f.), more superficial and unconcerned with theodicy, is prepared to accept the identification of fate with God's will.

The similarities between p.e.6.6 and the Oration are not sufficient to make one the source of the other. The Orator is much less polished than Eusebius, and includes among the similar themes ideas which are very different to his; also, the Orator does not mention or discuss the concept of ἀνάγκη, but uses τύχη/αὐτόματον together with εἱμαρμένη, when ἀνάγκη/εἱμαρμένη were the classical terms opposed to providence with which Eusebius grappled. The concerns motivating the preparatio evangelica are more classically philosophical than those addressed by the Orator, although they both use the common stock of arguments against determinism.

2.4.2: Or.160.2/p.e.1.3.9 Mras (1954/467) suggested two parallels between the preparatio evangelica and the Oration. One of these (Or.ch.16/p.e.1.4.2) is too general to show anything; the other (Or. 160.2/p.e.1.3.9,p.12.8,compare note in loc.) is of an identical phrase, μόνον οὐχὶ φωνὴν ἀφιέντων. Eusebius and the Orator use it in very different contexts, suggesting that it was a classical quotation which

both Eusebius and the translator of the Oration knew (see below VI.2.1.2); it does not of itself show dependence.

3. EUSEBIUS: GENERAL COMPARISONS

Although there are no direct connections between the works of Eusebius and the contents of the Oration, Eusebius' work provides a means of comparing the Oration with its context in the Greek Christian world in the time of Constantine, as Lactantius' works do for Latin Christianity. An exhaustive comparison is neither necessary nor useful: but in this section it is helpful to look at some more important points of comparison to see how the Oration stands against one contemporary Christian context. The problem of resolving the historical allusions in Eusebius and the Oration is addressed in chapter VII; here some aspects of Eusebius' orations and apologetics are considered.

3.1: Eusebius' orations

The *laus* has been shown (see Drake 1976/30-45) to consist of two separate orations: the panegyric on Constantine's tricennalia, and the oration on the Holy Sepulchre. In addition to these, Eusebius gives in full (*h.e.*10.4) his panegyric on the occasion of the rededication of the church at Tyre.

3.1.1: Form The form of Eusebius' orations is of interest: Drake (1976/36-9) analysed the two speeches in the *laus* to show that they were carefully planned examples of rhetoric; and the panegyric at Tyre follows a logical pattern in proclaiming God's nature and his victory over the persecutors, then describing the glories of the new building, all in biblically couched rhetoric. The Oration seems in comparison to be restrained and pedantic in language and theme, with no elaborate plan and little flowery language. Its author does not seem particularly skilled in writing elegantly, and mixes together philosophy, history, poetry and Christianity in a way which Eusebius did not. The Oration and the speeches of Eusebius are not in the same category. That does not however mean that the Oration was necessarily a written, not spoken, work. If Drake (1976/42f.) is right to identify the second part of the *laus* with the oration whose length embarrassed Eusebius before Constantine (*v.C.*4.33), then the Oration, being of comparable length, could have been delivered at one session.[4] The

fact that it is not polished rhetoric only precludes a rhetorician from having composed it: it does not mean that Constantine did not write it, only that someone such as Eusebius had little influence over its form and composition.

3.1.2: Contents There are a number of similarities between the contents of Eusebius' orations and those of the Oration. Their use of παῖς to describe Christ is striking, and is discussed below (6.5.2). They use the image of Christ as a physician of the soul and a teacher (h.e.10.4.10f.,35;laus 11.5/Or.165.27-30,167.5ff.,169.30f.,174.8ff.), see him as the founder of a new nation (h.e.10.4.19/Or.181.22ff.), and as the Logos who makes and orders the world (h.e.10.4.69;laus 11.12/Or. 156.16f.,158.16f.,168.21;but contrast 163.22-5) who is second after the Father (laus 1.6,11,12/Or.163.22-7). But Eusebius' orations are pervaded by a much greater awareness of theological issues than is the Oration: they have a relatively consistent view of the nature of the Logos, while the Orator is vague about the relationship between the Godhead and the world; Eusebius treats of the problem posed by the Incarnation for a doctrine of God (laus 14.6-11), which the Orator nowhere addresses; Eusebius sees the disciples as ordinary (laus 17.9), whereas the Orator sees them as wise before their call (Or. 167.5f.,174.12f.); he often includes biblical quotations, which the Orator never does, and he gives space to details of paganism (laus 13.1-14) which the Orator passes over in silence. Although there are some points of contact, the intellectual world of Eusebius is very different from that of the Orator. This is partly understandable if the Oration is pre-Nicene; yet even the panegyric at Tyre contains a much more coherent picture of the nature of the Godhead than the Oration does, and a basically biblical approach to its subject matter. Both the content and form of Eusebius' orations suggests that the Oration was written by someone who, when compared with Eusebius, was neither theologian nor rhetorician, but who shared with him some minor ideas and themes -- a suggestion which could certainly indicate Constantine.

3.2: Eusebius' apologetics

Eusebius' preparatio evangelica, demonstratio evangelica, and their later distillation the theophania, were his main contributions to Christian apologetic. A consideration of some particular points in each may convey the tenor of how they compare to the Oration; more

general summaries already exist which give an idea of how Eusebius' overall apologetic theology has features in common with the Oration, but is more systematic and theologically aware in its approach (see Wallace-Hadrill 1960/100-53;Grillmeier 1975/170-80;Barnes 1981/164-88).

3.2.1: preparatio evangelica The question referred to above (1.2.3) about the relationship between Plato in the Oration and Plato in Eusebius will be discussed in the next chapter; there are some connections, but no compelling reasons to suppose that the Orator drew on Eusebius. The connection between Eusebius' and the Orator's views on fate have already been discussed. There are other matters addressed by Eusebius which are similar to those in the Oration: e.g. p.e.7.10.1-8 deals with providence giving laws for regulating natural and moral life, similar to Or.154.9-18,160.26-161.14; although Eusebius puts this within the context of Moses' teaching to the Hebrews, and the Orator uses it as an argument against fate. There are some similarities of phrasing as well, e.g. τὴν παμμήτορα τῶν ὅλων φύσιν (p.e.7.10.3,p.380.3) and ὦ παμμήτειρα φύσις (Or.154.9), although these are used in different ways;[5] and in other places, where the same idea is expressed, very different words are used: e.g. Eusebius quoting Philo, τοῦ μὲν γὰρ γεγονότος ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τὸν πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν αἱρεῖ λόγος (p.e.8.13.3,p.462.3f.), compared to the Orator's ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸν δημιουργὸν τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ κήδεσθαι (Or.168.21). The Orator deals with Plato's ideas sketchily, and passes over uncomfortable doctrines such as the transmigration of souls; Eusebius goes into great detail in his evaluation of Plato and other philosophers, and how they compare to the Bible. There are remarkably few points of contact between the two works, given Eusebius' wide-ranging apologetic assessment of paganism; he never mentions the Sibylline Oracles, for example, although they are mentioned in his sources (i.e. Josephus,p.e.9.15;Clement,p.e.13.13.35,42).

3.2.2: demonstratio evangelica Eusebius' second major work of apologetic also has similarities of themes and vocabulary, but nothing to suggest direct dependence. Thus book three refers to the disciples and their teaching, but in a much more literal and biblical way than that found in the Oration, and expounds the cross in a way the Oration does not contemplate (compare e.g.d.e.3.7.19). Eusebius says that one Power made the world, shown by its ordering (d.e.4.5): a similar sentiment to chapters three and six of the Oration, but used in a

different way. In d.e.5.1.18 he says that the Son's begetting is unknown, drawing on Isaiah 53.8, unlike the apparently similar sentiments in Or.168.7-18. Eusebius also says that God the Father gave the σύστασις of the universe to the Logos (d.e.4.5.13,p.158.4), using the same word as Or.163.24; but Eusebius says elsewhere (d.e.4.3.13,p.154.17;5.1.8,p.211.25) that it is wrong to use διάστασις of the separation of the Son from the Father's substance, while the Orator uses it in just that way (Or.156.12).

3.2.3: theophania In this work Eusebius begins by attacking those who do not believe in providence, and then moves on to the teleological argument in the same way as chapter six of the Oration. In theoph.1.6 he asks how the world can consist of different elements which are mixed, in a way superficially similar to chapter thirteen of the Oration; but the latter is concerned with moral conduct, whereas Eusebius is discussing creation. He later says, 'Plato alone, of all the Greeks...held correctly, respecting that good Being who is the First, and Cause of all; and became truly wise, respecting the Second (Cause), who is the Creator of all' (theoph.2.24,p.89): akin to Or.163.18-25 in sentiment, but different in terminology, since the Orator holds the First to be creator of all. Book five of the theophania begins by mentioning in passing how men yet resist Christ, as they do even the clearest things such as the existence of universal providence: a statement which provides the general backdrop against which the Orator's attack on fate and accident in chapter six is directed. But book five goes on to deal with two objections to Christianity, that Christ was a magician and the disciples were liars, which are not touched on at all in the Oration.

3.3: Conclusion

A study of the works of Eusebius provides no grounds for supposing that the Orator was in any way dependent on them. Style, content and form are similar in some instances, but are generally very different. The orations of Eusebius were conceived by a theological rhetorician; the apologetic works were produced by a writer acquainted with a large stock of theological and philosophical writings, and a good knowledge of the Bible. The Oration reads in comparison as the work of a man unskilled in theology, a competent writer but no rhetorician, and a man only superficially acquainted with philosophy.

Using Eusebius' works as a backdrop for the Oration provides one perspective on its composition and how it compared to the Greek theology of its time. Another perspective is afforded by considering it alongside Christian apologetic writing from the second century onwards. Seeing the Oration as an example of the genre of Christian apologetic, and how its arguments compare with the works which preceded it, can help to discover not only any apparent sources, but also what the differences can show about the milieu in which it was written.

4. THE APOLOGISTS AND THE ORATION

4.1: Specific parallels

Pfättisch (1908/75ff.) suggested a number of parallels between the Oration and Theophilus of Antioch's ad Autolycum, in order to support his contention that the Oration was based on Greek not Latin apologetic. Bolhuis (1956/28ff.) added some more, but in the context of showing how the apologetics of the Oration were paralleled in the whole range of apologetic literature, and were not taken solely from Lactantius. Bolhuis' references show how Pfättisch's distinction between Greek and Latin apologetic was overdrawn; Theophilus was known and used in the West (see Ogilvie 1978/92), and the arguments of the apologists in both languages are similar. In this section the main parallels between the Oration and the ad Autolycum, where some degree of dependence is implied by Pfättisch, are considered in detail, in order to show how the relationship between the Oration and other apologetic is general and does not rely on specific dependence.

4.1.1: Autol.1.1/Or.158.10 Both authors use the phrase λόγοις μεμιασμένοις (Autol.p.2.3) to describe words about unholy topics, but in different contexts speaking of different subjects. It represents a common rhetorical flourish, not a dependent statement.

4.1.2: Autol.1.4,2.4,2.10/Or.169.19 Both Theophilus and the Orator maintain that creation is from nothing, using the phrase ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Theophilus however uses ποιέω not γεννάω (Autol.pp.6.16f.,26.19f.,38.22f.), and discusses creation in a philosophical way, unlike the Orator's passing ascription of praise to God.

4.1.3: Autol.1.6/Or.160.26-161.18 God's providence is extolled in these passages, but there are no verbal links; and Theophilus, unlike the Orator, makes considerable use of biblical allusions.

4.1.4: Autol.1.14,2.37/Or.163.13ff.,177.20-3 The theme of plagiarisation by the philosophers from the Bible is a common one in apologetic; and Theophilus alludes to it in the context of the resurrection, not with regard to Pythagoras as the Orator does.

4.1.5: Autol.2.2/Or.157.30-158.2 The incongruity of men making images which are then worshipped is a recurring theme in the Old Testament, which provides a common source for Christian apologetics.

4.1.6: Autol.2.3/Or.157.20-5 The affinity here, as Kurfess (1950/153) suggests, is not with Theophilus but with the Sibylline fragment which he quotes, saying that the gods would by now have generated themselves sufficiently to fill up the universe. Bolhuis (1956/29) notes that other writers point out the inconsistency of immortal gods having children; but only this particular fragment puts the argument in the same way as the Orator. The lack of verbal parallels however argues for a common idea rather than a direct leaning by the Orator on Theophilus or the Sibyl (see above III.6.1.2.1).

4.1.7: Autol.2.4,28,3.7 etc./Or.189.8 Theophilus sets great store by the divine μοναρχία: the Orator also stresses God's sole rule over the world, but in the main passage where this is discussed (156.19-157.17) the word μοναρχία does not occur; the equivalent phrase is τῇ ἐκείνου δεσποτείᾳ μόνου (156.20f.). Theophilus' Jewish roots (see Grant 1970/xvf.) and the Orator's philosophically based monotheism seem similar, but are not directly connected.

4.1.8: Autol.2.10,22/Or.160.32 The phrase λόγος ἐνδιάθετος occurs in both writers (Autol.pp.38.28,62.28f.); but not only was it in generally widespread use, but also Theophilus uses the phrase of the Logos before he was begotten, while the Orator refers it to God's innate wisdom in ordering the world, and does not use it in its normal theological sense. The Orator's closest references to Logos theology (compare 156.11ff.,160.32,163.27f.,168.7-17) compare the Logos to the Son or God's rationality, or speak of his generation in terms distinctly different from those used by Theophilus: their theological world is not the same.

4.1.9: Autol.2.12/Or.165.7 Both writers say that the poets are considered ἀξιόπιστοι (Autol.p.46.1); but Theophilus emphasises their errors and follies, while the Orator uses their trustworthiness to expose the ridiculous nature of their supposed gods. The terminology is similar, but the ideas are different.

4.1.10: Autol.2.15/Or.168.13f. Theophilus and the Orator are using the philosophical commonplace (so Grant 1970/51n.2) that a cause

precedes its effect in order to prove a point. They used available philosophical resources independently in framing their arguments.

4.1.11: Autol.2.25,3.23/Or.183.23 The word πρωτόπλαστος is used in all three places (Autol.pp.68.7,132.32) of the first human beings in Eden: there is however a common source in the LXX (Wisdom 7.1,10.1).

4.1.12: Autol.3.7/Or.163.31-164.22 In their discussions of Plato, Theophilus points out the contradiction between Plato's doctrines of the soul's immortality and of metempsychosis, while the Orator passes over the latter in silence, and has an altogether more positive approach to Plato.

4.2: General comparisons

It is thus apparent that the Orator did not depend on Theophilus as a source. The connections between them are, as Bolhuis shows, taken from a stock of common ideas. It is however interesting to note how the Orator often uses these ideas in an idiosyncratic way when compared to other apologetic, which led Bolhuis (1956/31) and others to conclude that the Orator did not work with particular sources. A consideration of three major examples will help to make this apparent.

4.2.1: Or.157.18-158.9 Chapter four of the Oration is intended to show that polytheism is self-contradictory and mistaken, and uses five main arguments: the gods were born and therefore will die; continual reproduction by the gods will crowd out heaven; the gods are immoral; idols are made by men; and the gods are apotheosised heroes. These arguments are found elsewhere: so Aristides (apol.1) says with regard to God that 'everything which has a beginning has also an end' (p.35), and therefore God has no beginning; Ps.-Justin (coh.Gr.23) says that everything that is created is corruptible, in discussing Plato's Tim. 41b; Minucius Felix (oct.34) says that all things will end, in speaking of the end of the world; and in the same context, Tertullian (ad.nat. 2.3.4,p.44.23f.) states habendo initium habebit et finem, the same sentiment as Or.157.18. But the Orator uses this idea regarding pagan gods, as no other apologist does. Again, the Orator's reference to γένεσις (157.19) is also found in Tatian (orat.21,PG 6.853A), where it is said to show the mortality of the gods, and in Arnobius (adv.nat. 1.28); and Arnobius (adv.nat.3.9) has the same argument as Or.157.22-5, that there would not be enough room for the gods if they continually reproduced. The Orator however is very sparing in his arguments, while other apologists go into much more detail. This is especially

apparent with regard to the dismissal of myths about the gods, which takes two sentences in the Oration (157.25-8), but which in most apologetics in dwelt on at length and in much detail (e.g.Theoph.Autol. 1.9f.,2.2-7;Tatian orat.8-10;Arnobius adv.nat.4-5). The attacks on idolatry (compare e.g.Arnobius adv.nat.6.9-16) and apotheosis (compare e.g.Min.Felix oct.20f.) are likewise very restrained. The Oration can hardly be so arranged out of a desire to save space, when the argument for providence is at least two chapters longer than it needs to be to make its point. It suggests rather a slightly different concern than that found in most of the apologists -- a point considered below (5).

4.2.2: Or.159.7-160.26 The first part of chapter six is concerned to deny that fate or chance have any power, and says that only God's providence can explain the natural and moral order of the world. Other apologists attack the idea of fate: thus Justin (1 apol.43) upholds free will and responsibility for man's actions as against fate; he also (2 apol.7) attacks the Stoic doctrine of fate because of the problem of theodicy and responsibility for evil. Tatian (orat.9) sees fate as the power of the demons, from which the Christians have been rescued; Minucius Felix (oct.11,36) agrees with the Orator in seeing 'fate' as another name for God's will; Athanasius (inc.2) attacks the Epicureans for believing in chance. But the apologists on the whole take the idea of providence for granted, except in the followers of Epicurus (compare e.g.Lact.inst.1.2), and see the question of fate on a philosophical rather than moral level: fate is untenable because it does not allow free will; while the Orator says that fate is untenable because it subverts the moral order of the world, and gives no encouragement to do right.

4.2.3: Or.160.26-162.28 The second part of chapter six, together with the next two chapters, argues in detail for the natural order which God has ordained, an argument which is intended to show that chance is illogical and that the world order supports right behaviour. The idea that God is manifest in the ordering of the world is common enough in the apologists (e.g.Arist.apol.1;Athenag.leg.13.2f.;Min.Felix oct.17f.; Theoph.Autol.1.6;Lact.inst.1.2;Athan.gent.35). The Orator is exceptional more for the length of his exposition than its contents -- although chapter eight on the distribution of metals is not used elsewhere in the apologists. As with the preceding passages, the concerns

of the Orator seem to have made for an emphasis on providence which other apologists considered unnecessary.

There are other themes in the Oration which have their parallels in the apologists, such as the relationship between Plato and Moses (Or.177.20-3), and the poets and the gods (Or.ch.10). They share the tendency already noted to use the general stock of ideas in a different way. In order to see why the Orator does this, we need to consider the overall stance of the Oration as an apologetic work.

5. THE ORATION AS APOLOGETIC

Pfättisch (1913a/96f.) saw the Oration as an apology explaining how a suffering Christ could be God, in order to remove the main obstacle which stood between pagans and Christianity. This is however only one of the Orator's apologetic concerns, and to make it the sole point distorts his apologetic intention. Bolhuis (1956/32) is more correct in seeing the Oration as fitting into the general framework of apologetic, but pays insufficient regard to its aims and direction. Hanson (1973/511) erroneously places the composition of the Oration in the reign of Julian, but is right to see it as an apologetic work; and Wendland (1902/230) concurs with this view. In order to understand the apologetic nature of the Oration, it is necessary to build up from its contents a picture of the case against which it is directed and the parallels to this in other literature, so that the context in which it was written can be made apparent.

5.1: The case against the Christians

There are two strands of argument found in the Oration against Christianity, taken from pagan philosophy and religion. The philosophers argue that they have testified to the truth (a view attacked in Or.ch.9): some believe in an ordered world, the ordering principle being φύσις (154.9-12,159.7f.) or εἱμαρμένη (159.8f.); others believe that αὐτόματον or τύχη rule the world (159.8f.,160.13f.,161.15-18), and that man imposes his own order on the world (160.18ff.), which is devoid of providence (154.14f.,161.19-22). The philosophical objections to Christianity are that God could not produce another God without becoming less and therefore imperfect (156.13-16), and that the idea of God being involved in generation is ridiculous (168.7ff.); also

that God could have changed men without needing to become incarnate (170.24ff.), and could have made the world good in the first place (171.27-34).

The religious objections are slightly different. They see philosophy as beautiful but impractical, preferring the poetic myths (164.23-9); there are many gods that rule the world (156.19-157.16), and they need to be worshipped rightly (compare Or.ch.4). The Christians are thus rightly persecuted for the sake of the gods (188.22f.). The Oration also contains (166.26-168.5) an obscure and long-winded rebuttal of an argument which seems to assert that Christ was a god who was actually killed by men against his own will, and whose purpose in coming to earth was thwarted. This may have been a pagan argument, although it could have been heretical or Gnostic: there is an implication of heresy at 167.17ff., associated with the veneration of images, which could refer to idolatry or to some kind of Gnostic worship.

5.2: Parallels

The tenets of pagan religion attacked in the Oration are very general, and are regularly dissected in the other apologists at great length: it is important to note here only the implication that pagans are still in a militant majority (187.23ff.;chs.22f.). There are numerous passages in the apologists which testify to the various views which pagan philosophers held of the world. Nature is attested as being seen as divine by Lactantius (inst.2.5), and is referred to as rerum omnium matrem by him (inst.3.28.4,p.264.14); Minucius Felix (oct.19) says that Strato and Epicurus saw Nature as God; and the philosopher in Macarius Magnes (apoc.4.2,p.159.15) speaks of ἡ γὰρ δημιουργὸς ἄνωθεν φύσις τόπους ἁρμόζοντας.[6] The Stoic idea of εἱμαρμένη is frequently attacked, e.g. by Justin (2 apol.7) and Eusebius (p.e.6.8); it is however interesting to note that Cicero's definition of fate, ordinem seriemque causarum, cum causae causa nexa rem ex se gignat (div.1.55), while denied in its original sense of being a fixed chain of causation by the Orator's comments on fate, is a concept later used (168.9-18) to expound the begetting of the Son. The Epicurean idea that the world exists αὐτοματῶς is attacked by Lactantius (inst.1.2) and Athanasius (inc.2.1); the similar views of Pythagoras and Euhemerus are noted by Theophilus (Autol.3.7). A concern for fate, free will and providence is common in the Middle Platonists (so Dillon 1977/44f.), and is perhaps reflected here. As regards the specific objections of philosophy to Christianity, these are also

found in the assertions of Celsus (Or.Cels.4.3) and the opponents of Athanasius (inc.44) that God could have corrected man without becoming incarnate, and in Arnobius (adv.nat.2.65) where the pagans say that God should compel man to trust him.

Apart from similarities with apologetic and philosophy, however, there are also links between what the Orator attacks and more popular belief, as seen for example in the Hermetica. Thus φύσις/πρόνοια/εἱμαρμένη are alternative names for the force that orders the world (Corp.Herm.1.19,11(i).5;compare Asclep.3.19b,39;Stob.Herm.15.1-2); εἱμαρμένη rules the stars and therefore the world (Stob.Herm.12), and the implications this has for the subversion of moral order (compare Corp.Herm.12(i).5;Stob.Herm.11.5) are avoided by asserting that the soul can choose to be free from the grip of fate (Corp.Herm.12(i).6f., 9;Stob.Herm.18.3ff.), which rules over the physical not the mental world (Stob.Herm.8.7).

5.3: The context of the Oration

The similarities between the Oration and other apologetic still do not explain its form. Pagan religion is lightly brushed off, with no reference to particular myths; and the attack on fate, chance and the lack of belief in providence does not mention Epicurus or other philosophers, a reluctance not encountered in the apologists or even elsewhere in the Oration (e.g.ch.9). Major objections against Christianity are not touched on at all, such as Porphyry's criticisms of the gospels (compare Mac.Mag.apoc.), the alleged obscenity of Christian worship (compare Tert.apol.2-9), and the doctrine of resurrection (compare Theoph.Autol.1.8,13). There are at least four reasons why the Oration appears different from other apologetic.

5.3.1: Form It is an oration, not a book. It cannot contain the detail of much longer written works. This explains why much is omitted, but does not account for the principles of selection which single out certain themes for particular attention, notably providence (chs.6-8) and the testimony of non-Christian sources to Christ (chs.18-21). There is a curious mixture of the general and the particular in the Oration: a detailed exposition of God's undivided sovereignty in chapter three is followed by a short blanket condemnation of paganism; a vague reference to the prophets is followed by nore on Moses and a detailed account of Daniel, but no details of actual prophecies are given except for non-Christian sources. Why is this?

5.3.2: Audience Part of the reason is that the Oration was delivered to an audience who were apparently Christian (see Or.154.1,5-9,155.21-5). Apologetic is directed at those outside the church, even if they never read it; the Orator must have been treading a difficult path between affirming the truths of the faith (e.g.ch.5 on creation) and giving the audience material with which to support those truths against their opponents (e.g.chs.6-8 on providence). The lack of a detailed refutation of paganism or philosophy is thus understandable, since the audience needed no further convincing, and they would have known the biblical background to the argument. The Oration generally contains detailed discussions which are intended to expound the Orator's particular apologetic insights[7] or go into theological detail which would be relevant to the hearers.[8] The mainly positive assessment of Plato, and the use of non-Christian source material, was intended to give Christians more material with which to fight against paganism.

5.3.3: Author The character of the author is important too. He is not very philosophically inclined, and tends to emphasise the practical and moral consequences of belief. The choice of themes was not predetermined by apologetic custom, but came out of the Orator's concerns. The difference is clearly apparent when the Oration is compared to Eusebius' apologetic oration on the Holy Sepulchre (laus 11-18), which, while also delivered to a Christian audience, is logical and consistent in its treatment of material. The Orator by contrast gives the impression of a mind entranced by detail, but with little grasp of a coherent overall theology or consistency of approach. We do not know how he went about the process of composition: did he make a plan from scratch? Or did he incorporate parts from other speeches or treatises, which could explain why some parts are covered in more detail? The present form of the Oration suggests that it was written as a whole -- there are no obvious lacunae due to editing -- and that the detailed portions reflect the author's particular concerns.

5.3.4: Intellectual level These concerns affect the level at which the apologetic is directed. Unlike the majority of apologetic writing, which is written for the intellectuals of the ancient world, the Oration is directed more towards the level of popular religion. There is in particular an awareness that most people do not believe in God or providence (Or.154.12-15,159.7ff.,161.15f.,163.33-164.3;compare 166.5f.,172.24ff.,187.23-7). The long exposition of God's providence

in nature in chapters six to eight may be due to the Orator's wonder at the order of nature, but it is more likely to be concerned to refute the ideas of popular astrology rather than those of classical philosophy. The ideas of Epicurus were limited in appeal; but, as the Hermetica show, deterministic ideas about fate and the influence of astrology were popular, and Nock (1933/100ff.) has pointed out how widespread they were. This concern with astrology is consistent with the practical approach of the Orator, who wanted to establish right worship and obedience to God in the face of the individualistic determinism of popular religion.

An assessment of the Oration as apologetic thus puts it in context as the work of a strong but unusual and non-intellectual mind. Its apologetic content generally supports its claim to have been delivered to Christians; Baynes' view (1931/56) that it was adapted to be part of 'the emperor's propaganda for the conversion of the pagans' begs the question of why it was not adapted further to be a more coherent attack on paganism. The popular level of the argument for providence invites us to treat with caution the view of Barnes (1981/74) that the Oration shows a particular indebtedness to the philosophies of Middle Platonism. The references to paganism and persecution reinforce the case for its composition in the first quarter of the fourth century; and the impression gained of its author is compatible with what we know of Constantine. There is no evidence to show that the Oration is rooted in Greek as distinct from Latin apologetic, or vice-versa, or that the author has drawn on any one writer in particular. Its peculiarities as an apologetic piece are explained by its context.

6. ΠΑΙΣ

6.1: The problem

This chapter is concluded by a discussion of how the way in which παῖς is used of Christ in the Oration affects our view of its context. There are nine references to Christ as παῖς in the Oration (156.3,163.28,29,167.21,168.2,4,8,174.8,179.7), and it is also used to translate puer in the Fourth Eclogue (182.11); υἱός occurs in the text only twice, in one sentence (168.17f.), and twice in the chapter headings (151.11,152.21). This seems rather incongruous: why, if the Oration was translated, is the unusual term παῖς preferred to the normal υἱός?

And why is παῖς used everywhere but in one phrase? It is possible that the juxtaposition of πατήρ/υἱός provides the explanation for why this section on the begetting of the Son begins with πόθεν ἡ προσηγορία τοῦ παιδός (168.7f.), when υἱός comes a few lines later on -- although πατήρ/παῖς occurs at 156.2f., showing that this cannot be an absolute rule. Why, similarly, does the introduction to the (υἱός) acrostic speak of Christ as θεὸν ὄντα καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα (179.6f.)? A straightforward translation would have been expected to have been more consistent. Does it reflect an underlying Latin puer, as in the Fourth Eclogue? Or has the παῖς of the Eclogue influenced the translation of the Oration? There are three issues raised: how this usage relates to pagan and Christian Greek documents of the time; whence it originates; and its implications regarding the writing and translation of the Oration. It is necessary to consider the different strands of evidence in order to provide an explanation which will shed further light on the authorship of the Oration.

6.2: Modern writers

Only Pfättisch (1908/65n.2), out of all the scholars who have studied the Oration in the last hundred years, has noted the use of παῖς in the Oration, and suggested that this was due to the influence of Plato. In support of this idea he proposed that the Orator was thinking of Tim.42e, where it is used of subsidiary gods below the Creator. But Plato uses the word in the plural at that point, as he does in Tim.40e where the poets are ironically said to be παῖδες θεῶν. Elsewhere in the Timaeus it is used of children (21b) and the Greek race (22b), or in the singular to refer to the mythical children of the gods (e.g.22c). Nowhere in his works does Plato use the phrase παῖς θεοῦ (see Brandwood). Pfättisch's suggestion is due to his view that a Platonising Greek was responsible for the present draft of the Oration, and is not borne out by the evidence.

Harnack (1926) undertook a detailed analysis of how the designation of Christ as παῖς θεοῦ was used in the early church. He concluded (pp.233-8) that although there were places where some influence of the myth of the heavenly child was possible, the occasional use of παῖς was confined to liturgical and doxological formulae, often qualified by ἀγαπητός or μονογενής, and to poetic and sacral discourse. The only places where παῖς occurs in the apologists are three times in Diognetus (ep.Diog.8.9,11,9.1), where it appears to be liturgically based, the rest of the epistle using υἱός: and twice in Athenagoras

(leg.12.3, p.26.8,11) where it is used interchangeably with υἱός in referring to the Trinity. Harnack ranged widely over Christian literature, including martyrologies and the Sibylline Oracles, and painted a consistent picture of how παῖς was used: a tidy conclusion which has been echoed by later writers (e.g.Jeremias 1967/703). It is not however a conclusion which sheds any light on the problem in hand. Although Harnack's main conclusion, that παῖς was used primarily in liturgically-based contexts, remains valid, he has paid insufficient regard to the evidence offered by Eusebius (whom he quotes very selectively) and other writers as to how the term was used in the early fourth century in particular. He looks at the evidence only from the two perspectives of the New Testament use of παῖς and the heavenly child myth, without allowing for two other influences which provide a better explanation for the form of the Oration. Before looking at this evidence however, it is necessary to consider the possibility that the form of the text we now possess is explained by a literal translation of an underlying puer.

6.3: Latin background

Harnack (1926/218) pointed out that the earliest Latin versions of Acts 3f. use puer to translate παῖς, but very early on this was corrected to filius; and the Latin versions of the Martyrdom of Polycarp refer to the Son as filius (1926/222). The Acts of the Martyrs have some references to puer which Harnack classed with Gnostic works as being derived from the heavenly child myth (p.215); and Hippolytus also used the standard doxology per...puerum tuum Iesum Christum (1926/227f.). But apart from these, there are very few uses of puer with reference to Christ, and none at all in the Latin apologists. Harnack (1926/237f.) explained this by pointing to the difference in meaning between παῖς and puer, the latter having a more subordinationist sense, with filius or minister being preferred instead. When Latin theology and apologetic so avoided puer, it seems unlikely that it could be the basis for the use of παῖς in the Oration.

There is however another influence to consider, that of Latin pagan religion. Norden (1924) investigated the heavenly child motif as found in the Fourth Eclogue, and noted (p.3) that the poem was used by Lactantius, Augustine and Constantine. It is however unlikely that the puer of the Eclogue accounts for the use of παῖς in the Oration: Virgil's poem is included as one part of the whole, and does not act as a climax or determine the form of other parts of the Oration; and

Lactantius and Augustine, while using Virgil, do not refer to the heavenly puer. Norden (p.75n.1) mentions some inscriptions in which a god is described as (deus) bonus puer, under Oriental influence; this designation is not widespread, and the form dei puer is not used. In imperial nomenclature, Octavian and Tiberius called themselves divi filius/θεοῦ υἱός, but not puer, and their successors did not make much use of the title (see Michel 1978/635;Bureth 1964). There seems to be little evidence apart from the Fourth Eclogue to suggest that the title puer had any particular pagan religious significance, or that it was used of Christ independently of its roots as a translation of παῖς: it is thus unlikely that the Orator originally used puer, since there are insufficient grounds for explaining why it would have been used instead of filius.

6.4: Pagan background

Harnack (1926/224) listed a dozen references in Origen's contra Celsum where Celsus refers to Christ as παῖς, and suggested that they were a possible analogy with pagan forms, quoting in support Corp.Herm. 13.14, paralleled by Cels.5.2,7.9. He has however omitted to note that in the Oration a similar phrase is used three times:

Or.163.27f.:	θεὸς...καὶ θεοῦ παῖς	
167.21:	θεόν τε καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα	
179.6f.:	θεὸν...καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα	
Cels.5.2:	θεὸς...καὶ θεοῦ παῖς	(p.2.20)
7.9:	θεὸς...ἢ θεοῦ παῖς	(p.161.7)
Corp.Herm.13.2:	θεοῦ θεὸς παῖς	(p.240.2f.)
13.14:	θεὸς...καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς παῖς	(p.248.17)

The contexts are significant: Celsus says that no God or son of God has or will come down to earth (5.2), and that many 'prophets' falsely claim to be a god or son of a god or divine spirit (7.9). The two references in the Corpus Hermeticum state that one who is reborn or enlightened becomes a god and son of God/the One. The phrase is used by the Hermetist of a person with a special relationship to God. But it is particularly used in our sources with reference to Christ in the context of the controversy with paganism, as Celsus does: thus Libanius' funeral oration on Julian describes how the emperor wrote to refute the books which made the man from Palestine a god and Son of God:

Lib.or.18.178: θεόν τε καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα

It is important to note that the Orator uses this phrase once in the context of his assessment of Plato, and twice in asserting the divinity of Christ against the scepticism of unbelievers. Eusebius uses the same phrase three times in the apologetic demonstratio evangelica, twice in book three to describe the preaching of the disciples, and once in book five in expounding the nature of the Logos:

Eus.d.e.3.5.57:	θεὸν...καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα	(p.121.11)
3.7.28:	θεὸν...καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα	(p.145.10)
5.15.2:	θεοῦ παῖς καὶ...θεός	(p.238.29)

There are also traces of the phrase in other forms. Athanasius' de incarnatione speaks of Christ in a similar way:

Athan.inc.19:	θεὸς...καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός	(p.180.25)
53:	θεὸς...καὶ θεοῦ υἱός	(p.266.16f.)
55:	θεὸν καὶ θεοῦ υἱόν	(p.272.36)

The Sibyl, quoted by Lactantius in the Divine Institutes and the epitome, exhorts men to know Christ:

Orac.Sib.8.329:	θεὸν θεοῦ υἱόν	

And Lactantius himself states that the prophets foretold Christ's coming so that he might be known as Son of God and God:

Lact.epit.44(49).3:	et dei filius et deus	(p.723.3f.)

The apocriticus of Macarius Magnes affords confirmation of this usage of παῖς by pagan opponents to Christianity. The philosopher uses παῖς twice in reference to Christ, stating that his sayings were unworthy of a wise man or παῖδος θεοῦ (3.2,p.53.6), and that at the temple Jesus should have demonstrated ὅτι θεοῦ παῖς ἐστι (3.18,p.98.11). Both of these are ambiguous, and could mean either 'Son of God', or more likely 'a son of God'. The only other time when the philosopher refers to the Son, he states that the υἱός confesses that God is the Father of heaven and earth, in the context of Matthew 11.25 (apoc. 4.7,p.165.10). The Christian on the other hand refers repeatedly to Christ as υἱός (2.21,pp.43.4,44.17;3.9,p.70.14;3.14,pp.92.25,30ff.; 3.23,pp.105.29,106.7;3.27,pp.116.18,25,117.21f.,29;4.25,p.209.20-34), and twice as παῖς: he says (3.8) that Christ did not deserve to be judged neither God nor Son of God, and (3.9) refers to the philosopher's argument that Christ was neither God nor Son of God:

apoc.3.8:	οὐκέτι...θεὸς οὐδὲ θεοῦ παῖς	(p.66.24f.)
3.9:	μή πη θεὸς ὄντως καὶ θεοῦ παῖς	(p.70.3f.)

Our consideration of the evidence suggests that, at least from Celsus in the second century to Libanius in the fourth, the designation of Christ as θεὸς καὶ θεοῦ παῖς was occasionally used by Christians

and pagans in debating together, following a pagan religious model; and that this has influenced the Orator in his use of this phrase. Whether or not it translates an original deus et dei filius is debatable: it could perhaps have been an addition at the stage of translation; but the occurrence of the phrase in Lactantius does imply that it was known in Latin as well as Greek.

6.5: The imperial connection

The writings of Eusebius afford evidence for another influence on the Orator's use of παῖς. Apart from the phrases in the demonstratio evangelica noted above, παῖς only occurs twice in the major apologetic works (p.e.4.15.8,p.190.7;d.e.3.7.20,p.144.2), both times in the form τὸν μονογενῆ παῖδα which Harnack has already noted as having liturgical roots. It is the historical works and the orations which are of particular interest here.

6.5.1: Historical works In the historia ecclesiastica Eusebius quotes Melito of Sardis as referring to the son of the emperor as παῖς (4.26.7, p.384.24), but does not use the word in the text himself until the very last chapter (10.9). In that lyrical passage he refers to the sons of Constantine as παῖς/παῖδες four times (10.9.4,6,7,9,pp.900.10, 902.1,12,20): the reference to Crispus as υἱός (10.9.4,p.900.13) can be explained as being due to the juxtaposition with πατήρ. He also refers to the Saviour as παῖς in that section, in drawing the parallel between Constantine and Crispus on one hand and the Father and Son on the other:εἶθ' οἷα παμβασιλεῖ θεῷ θεοῦ τε παιδὶ σωτῆρι ἁπάντων ποδηγῷ καὶ συμμάχῳ χρώμενοι, πατὴρ ἅμα καὶ υἱὸς ἄμφω κώπλῳ διελόντες τὴν κατὰ τῶν θεομισῶν παράταξιν (p.900.11-14). The designation of the Son as παῖς not υἱός is influenced by imperial nomenclature. This is more apparent in the v.C.: out of fifty occurrences of the word in the text (see index in GCS 1975), thirty-nine refer to the sons of the imperial family, nine to children in general, one to the Greek race, and one to Christ. The last reference (1.32.2,p.31.21) is of the liturgical form already noted, μονογενῆ παῖδα. By contrast, Eusebius uses υἱός only nine times: seven of these are as variants on παῖς[9] and only two refer to υἱὸς θεοῦ (1.41,p.37.4;4.48,p.140.16). This evidence suggests that παῖς was regularly used of the imperial family at the court of Constantine, and that this influenced its application to Christ in the Oration.[10]

6.5.2: Orations The panegyric at Tyre (h.e.10.4) refers to Christ as παῖς four times (10.4.11,p.866.5;16,p.868.1,8;56,p.878.19), and as υἱός only once (10.4.23,p.870.1) in the course of alluding to Hebrews 7.3. None of the references is in an obviously liturgical form; but the oration was delivered to a clerical audience in church before Eusebius had come under the rule of Constantine, suggesting that Christian oratory could use παῖς inoffensively of Christ, either on the basis of conservative liturgical practice, or else because it was following set patterns of rhetoric. The orations in the laus present a clearer picture: the tricennial oration uses παῖς four times of the imperial family (3.1,p.200.24;3.4,p.201.11;9.18,p.221.28;10.5,p.223.11), and once speaks of the Logos as μονογενῆ παῖδα (6.19,p.211.25), while also having a reference to the μονογενῆ υἱόν (3.6,p.202.4f.); the oration on the Holy Sepulchre uses παῖς once of children (16.7,p.250.15) and twice of the Saviour (17.13,15,pp.258.15,259.1) and twice refers to the Logos as μονογενὴς υἱός (12.4,8,pp.230.18,231.28). This suggests that the liturgical phrase μονογενὴς παῖς was at this time being replaced by μονογενὴς υἱός, and that either could be used; that imperial usage has not surprisingly influenced the tricennial oration; and that the oration on the Holy Sepulchre has no trace of the liturgical use of παῖς, but uses it at the end of chapter seventeen in the apologetic debate with paganism: the θεοῦ παῖδα μόνον (p.258.15) has finally been proclaimed, the one who is ἀληθῶς παῖδα θεοῦ (p.259.1).

6.6: Conclusion

An assessment of the use of παῖς in the Oration has several implications for our inquiry into its authorship. First, the Oration was not written using puer to describe Christ. This means either that it was written in Greek after all, or more likely that παῖς was substituted for filius to bring the translation into line with the contemporary practice of Greek Christian orators. Second, the origins of this use of παῖς lie in the debate with paganism, and possibly in the practice of the court of Constantine: Harnack's two classifications of liturgical formula or heavenly child myth do not provide an explanation which fits the evidence. Third, the early fourth century provides a very plausible context for this use of παῖς, in that the works of Eusebius witness to it as no other extant documents do; and the impression that the Orator is addressing a Christian audience tallies with the use of παῖς in the oration at Tyre. Finally, the particular way in which παῖς is used in the Oration can be explained as a result of translation

into this Greek Christian rhetorical context. Thus the anomalous use of υἱός (Or.168.17f.) conforms to the general, though not universal, practice when there is the juxtaposition of πατήρ/υἱός: the phrase θεὸν...καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα (179.6f.) which introduces the acrostic, whether it represents exactly a Latin original, or is an expanded version of filius dei, is there because of the consistency of the translation, even in a context where υἱός would have fitted better (as at 168.8); and the use of υἱός in the heading of chapter five shows that the headings were not produced by the writer or translator of the Oration.

CHAPTER V - PLATO

BOOKLIST

Armstrong,A.H.(ed.) The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy (Cambridge,1967).

Barnes,T.D. 'The Emperor Constantine's Good Friday Sermon', Journal of Theological Studies, 27 (1976a) 414-23.

--- Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

Baynes,N.H. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church (London, 1931).

Daniélou,J. Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, translated by J.A. Baker, A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, 3 vols (London,1964-77) II (1973).

Dibelius,M. James (Philadelphia,1976).

Dillon,J. The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220 (London,1977).

Dörries,H. Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins (Göttingen,1954).

Dräseke,J. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 25 (1908) 1339-44.

Hartmann,W. Konstantin der Grosse als Christ und Philosoph in seinen Briefen und Erlassen, Beilage zum Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde (Fürstenwalde,1902).

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius 1, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Kurfess,A. 'Platos Timaeus in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 19 (1919-20) 72-81.

--- 'Lactantius und Plato', Philologus, 78 (1923) 381-92.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologie und Glaube, 39 (1949) 167-74.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 130 (1950) 145-65.

Loeschcke,G. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, usw.', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 12 (1910) 357-9.

McCracken,G. Arnobius of Sicca: The Case Against the Pagans, Ancient Christian Writers Series 7-8, 2 vols (Westminster,Maryland,1949) I.

Mancini,A. 'La Pretesa Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum', Studi Storici, 3 (1894) 92-117,207-28.

Millar,F. The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.-A.D.337) (London, 1977).

Ogilvie,R.M. The Library of Lactantius (Oxford,1978).

Pfättisch,J.M. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

--- 'Platos Einfluss auf die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 92 (1910) 399-417.

Piganiol,A. 'Dates Constantiniennes', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, 12 (1932) 369-72.

Places,E.de 'Numénius et Eusèbe de Césarée', in ed. Livingstone,E., Studia Patristica, 13 (Berlin,1975) pp.19-28.

Rossignol,J.P. Virgile et Constantin le Grand (Paris,1845).

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzietung, 29 (1908) 3096-9.

Stiglmayr,J. 'Rezensionen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 33 (1909) 346-52.

Wendland,P. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen: Eusebius Werke 1, hrsg. von I. Heikel, usw.', Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift, 22 (1902) 225-36.

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between the Oration and the works of Plato has been assessed in different ways by different scholars. That there is some kind of relationship is indisputable, given the discussion of Plato's doctrines in chapter nine of the Oration (163.15-164.22): but how close it is and what its implications are have been matters of debate. Rossignol (1845/vif.,263-313) maintained that there were a large number of resemblances between the Oration and Plato's writings, and therefore that Constantine could not have written the Oration because he knew no Plato; Mancini (1894/97ff.) questioned Rossignol's views on Constantine's lack of knowledge of Greek, and pointed out (p.224n.2) that many of his suggested parallels with Plato were erroneous. Heikel (1902/xcv) accepted that thoughts and expressions in the Oration were similar to some found in Plato, and suggested a series of similarities (1902/265;1911/4-23) which he qualified as reminiscences rather than quotations (1902/xcv); he thought that the Orator might have gained his philosophical background from a compendium (1902/xcvi n.1). He also noted (1902/xcviii) that it was odd that a translation from the Latin should have so many Platonic expressions, and later concluded (1911/23f.) that because Constantine did not show evidence of Platonic thinking elsewhere, a point agreed by Hartmann (1902/33;compare Baynes 1931/56), he could not have been the Orator, and thus the Oration was written by a Greek author, rather than being a translation made with a philosophical colouring.

The strongest assertion of Platonic influence was made by Pfättisch in his monograph of 1908 (pp.47-66), where he maintained that Plato was used reverentially and carefully in the first fifteen chapters of the Oration, supporting his case for it being the work of a Greek reviser of Constantine's sermon. Pfättisch's reviewers were sceptical about the extent of his claims: Schwartz (1908/3098) said that Pfättisch was wrong, and that the Oration showed little dependence upon Plato; that the Plato of the fourth century, as represented in Eusebius' preparatio evangelica and theophania, would have furnished the Orator's source material; and that a translator would have drawn on a stock of standard Platonic phrases. Loeschcke (1910/358) remained unconvinced by Pfättisch's suggested parallels, maintaining that he had not proved the use or quotation of original Platonic documents, and that he also unfairly ignored other parallels: thus the phrase Ἀγαθὸν οὗ πάντα ἐφίεται (Or.156.9) was plainly drawn from Aristotle eth.nic.1.1, while Pfättisch tried to show it was from Plato. Drăseke

(1908/134l) and Stiglmayr (1909/347) pointed out Pfättisch's error in trying to base the argument of the Oration on the mistranslated 'Platonic thought' κόσμος φύσεως ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ζωή (154.12); Stiglmayr (1909/35ln.2) conceded that the Orator used Plato, but agreed with Schwartz that it was from derived and not direct sources, which explained errors such as the false charge levelled against Socrates (163.8-11). Heikel's close analysis of Platonisms in the Oration (1911/3-23) refutes some of Pfättisch's suggestions, while allowing that some could have a sound basis.

Somewhat stung by these rejoinders, Pfättisch produced an article (1910) which argued in detail for a substantial connection between the ideas in chapters three, nine and eleven and some of Plato's original works: as against Schwartz, he said (pp.415f.) that the Oration showed more knowledge of Plato than Eusebius' works did, and that the Oration was plainly a unified composition and could not be a translation from the Latin decorated with Platonic phrases. Pfättisch's article was assessed by Kurfess (1919-20), who suggested (pp.75-9) that the Orator may have used a compendium, that a Greek translator could have inserted Platonic phrases and expressions, and that possibly Constantine used Cicero's translation of the Timaeus, the Latin quotations of which were translated by the equivalent phrases in the original. He later emphasised the idea of a compendium (1949/172n.10), having noted the use of one by Lactantius (1923/382;compare Ogilvie 1978/81). More recently Barnes (1981/73ff.) has argued for the Constantinian authorship of the Oration despite its Platonisms, on the basis that Constantine was well-educated, and suggests an indebtedness to Calcidius' commentary on the Timaeus[1] and the works of Numenius of Apamea: he does not however provide any specific examples of such indebtedness, nor does he explain how the present Greek text was derived from the Latin -- did Constantine really use Greek philosophical allusions in a Latin speech? Barnes raises the questions anew, but does not provide a sufficient answer.

There has thus been a wide spectrum of scholarly opinion, ranging from Schwartz's denial of Platonic influence to Pfättisch's wholehearted advocacy, with most scholars somewhere in between. The presence of some Platonisms in the Oration has been variously interpreted to show that it was written by a Greek philosopher (Pfättisch), a Greek rhetorician (Heikel), a Christian theologian (Hartmann), or Constantine (Barnes). In order to establish the truth more clearly, it is first necessary to establish how valid the alleged parallels of phrase and

thought are, and then to put them into the context of how Plato was viewed by other Christian authors of the time.

2. PARALLELS OF FORM

This section works consecutively through the Oration conflating into one sequence the parallels with Plato suggested by Heikel and Pfättisch: Rossignol's list was assessed and corrected by Heikel, and later scholars have suggested no further similarities. For the sake of clarity, general and ungrounded suggestions are omitted, and the substantive parallels (chs.3.1,9.2-7,11.8) are dealt with in greater detail in the next section.

2.1: Or.154.12/Tim.66c,62b The phrases κατὰ φύσιν and παρὰ φύσιν both occur here, and they occur on their own in other places in the Timaeus; Pfättisch suggests that the Platonic usage provides a key to their translation in the Oration. But the phrases were much more widespread than in Plato alone (e.g.Eus.p.e.6.6.47,p.307.19,22f.). Plato's usage is hardly a key to unlock the meaning of these phrases when he and others use them in different ways.

2.2: Or.154.14/Tim.30a The Orator's ἀτάκτως τε καὶ πλημμελῶς is paralleled by Plato's πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως. Although the contexts are superficially similar -- the Orator speaking on the renunciation of providence, Plato on God bringing order to the world -- the ideas are not linked, and the similarity is of phrase not meaning. Heikel and others have failed to notice the occurrence of the phrase again (165.21), this time in its exact Platonic form, but in a totally different context, confirming that it is used as rhetorical decoration without dependence on Plato's ideas. Such rhetorical dependence is not necessarily due to direct borrowing from Plato: not only does this passage from the Timaeus occur in isolation elsewhere (e.g.Eus.p.e. 15.6.4), but the phrase may have been one in common use. If the Orator used it, other writers and orators could have done so too. The Orator uses ἄτακτος on its own elsewhere (169.20,172.30,177.12), suggesting that it was a well-known and well-used word.

2.3: Or.155.15/Phd.66c The Orator says that unbelief produces στάσεις, πόλεμοι, μάχαι: Plato maintains that the body distracts the mind from philosophy by causing καὶ πολέμους καὶ στάσεις καὶ μάχας. Heikel (1911/6f.) argued that Pfättisch was incorrect in holding this to be a

parallel, because the difference in context precluded a connection; that does not rule out a merely verbal borrowing, although the different word order shows that it is not a quotation but at most an accepted classical phrase.[2] There are examples of different lists of vices in the Oration at e.g.156.23f.,157.8ff., where there is no apparent Platonic influence.

2.4: Or.155.25/Rep.613a Both references state that the friends of the gods are looked after by them; this is hardly a singularly unusual religious idea, and there is no verbal similarity to suggest any dependence.

2.5: Or.155.30/Phdr.254a The Orator says that love for God 'overcomes modesty', αἰδῶ βιάζεται: Plato, speaking of the image of the chariot and horses, says that the obedient horse αἰδοῖ βιαζόμενος keeps love and self-control. This again looks like a general allusion to a classical form of phrasing rather than a specific borrowing from Plato, particularly so in that βιάζομαι is used in an active sense by the Orator and passively by Plato.

2.6: Or.156.2/Laws 811c,Rep.499b The Orator uses the phrase (θεία) ἐπίπνοια (compare 154.16,165.7,179.15), and Plato similarly refers to τινὸς ἐπιπνοίας θεῶν (Laws), ἔκ τινος θείας ἐπιπνοίας (Rep.). The Orator however uses it as a cirumlocution for God's spirit, and does not qualify it with τις as Plato does. The idea of divine inspiration is hardly singular enough to require dependence, and the vocabulary is commonplace.

2.7: Or.156.20/Pol.269e The Orator's statement that there is ἕνα... προστάτην over the world is ascribed by Pfättisch to Plato's use of the term; but Plato only uses προστάτης of a ruler of a city or state, and never of the demiurge in a metaphysical context like that found in the Oration.[3]

2.8: Or.156.28/Tim.28a The Orator asks how τὸν συμπάσης γενέσεως δημιουργόν might be known if the world is not a unity; Plato refers to uniformity (κατὰ ταὐτά, compare Or.156.27), γένεσις, and ὁ δημιουργός, but only in discussing aspects of creation, not in asserting the essential unity of the world. There is no reason to see the Orator as dependent on the Timaeus here.

2.9: Or.157.18ff./Tim.28a,41b Plato (Tim.28a) contrasts τὸ ὂν ἀεί, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον with τὸ γιγνόμενον ἀεί, ὂν δὲ οὐδέποτε, later asserting that the latter is γιγνόμενον καὶ ἀπολλύμενον. This is similar in sentiment to the Oration, but has no similar phrases; and, as noted above (IV.4.2.1), this argument is used by other Christian

apologists, showing that to ascribe its source to Plato is to ignore the apologetic context in which the Oration was written. Plato also says that the gods were generated and are neither ἀθάνατοι nor ἄλυτοι, but will be given immortality by the will of God (Tim.41b); not only does this also use different vocabulary from that found in the Oration, but it argues for the opposite conclusion, that the gods are immortal -- unlike the Orator's question πῶς οὖν ἄν οἱ ἐκ γενέσεως φθαρτῆς εἶεν ἀθάνατοι; Pfättisch is thus wrong to argue for dependence.

2.10: Or.157.29/Phdr.277e The Orator's phrase ὕμνους ἐμμέτρους ἢ καὶ ἄνευ μέτρου, used of the praises of the gods, is similar to Plato's λόγον, ἐν μέτρῳ οὐδ' ἄνευ μέτρου referring to good or bad writing; the context is not similar however, and the difference in wording militates against this being anything more than a normal turn of speech common to both writers.

2.11: Or.158.1f./Tim.41a Plato refers to God as δημιουργὸς πατήρ τε ἔργων. The Orator's reference to the sculptor of idols as πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν τοῦ ἀγάλματος may well be an ironical allusion to a common epithet for the Supreme God, but the different word order suggests that it was not taken directly from Plato.

2.12: Or.158.6/Tim.28a Heikel (1911/10) claimed that the Orator's phrase τὸ...νῷ θεατὸν καὶ διανοίᾳ περιληπτόν is Platonic. The nearest parallel is Tim.28a, where Plato says that the eternal is τὸ...νοήσει μετὰ λόγου περιληπτόν, not a very close verbal similarity: the word περιληπτόν only occurs twice more in the Timaeus and nowhere else in Plato, and in neither of the other occurrences does it form part of this phrase. Perhaps Heikel meant that the sentiment rather than the wording is Platonic, which, while true, says nothing about any specific dependence on Plato for such a generally held conception.

2.13: Or.158.12f./Phdr.243d Plato has a similar rhetorical flourish to that of the Orator, with both desiring cleansed speech; but the Orator ascribes the cleansing to God, and Plato to the effects of pure discourse. There are no similarities of vocabulary and no evident dependence.

2.14: Or.158.16-159.6 Pfättisch argues that the creation story found in the Oration muddles Genesis and Plato, and quotes several parallels in support: e.g. men should multiply (Or.158.23ff./Pol.274a), learn skills (Or.158.25f./Laws 679a,Pol.274cf.), and fight against wild beasts (Or.159.1/Pol.274b,Pro.322b). These are however only general points of similarity, and do not show that the Orator depended on Plato, when his source could have been in the Bible and its exegesis.

The closest parallel he suggests is that of Tim.41dff., where each soul is allotted to a star and undergoes transmigration according to its moral condition: this is however very different from the Orator's view that man first lived in a paradise beyond the sphere of the earth (158.17-20). The Orator knows of no transmigration, and Plato provides few details of his creation story in comparison to the account in Genesis; the Orator's view of creation is not simply biblical, but is not drawn directly from scattered references in Plato.

2.15: Or.158.24f./Laws 678b Plato wrote πληθύοντος δ' ἡμῶν τοῦ γένους, in the context of the time after the Deluge; the similar phrase in the Oration could well be drawn from Genesis 1.28, especially if the unanimous MSS reading πληθύνοντος is followed.

2.16: Or.159.8f./Laws 888e The Orator refers to φύσις/εἱμαρμένη/αὐτόματον as causes of the world; Plato says that things owe their existence to φύσις/τύχη/τέχνη, and gives an ordered explanation of things using those terms, while the Orator seeks to dismiss such causes as denials of providence. The vocabulary is not sufficiently similar to assume that the Orator knew of Plato.

2.17: Or.159.10ff./Gor.489e,Pro.349b The Orator argues that εἱμαρμένη is a word without content; Plato decries the speaking in arguments of mere words which signify nothing (Gor.489e), and discusses what certain words signify (Pro.349b). Plato does not refer to fate, but to linguistic analysis; the Orator's argument is polemical and relates to a specific question.

2.18: Or.159.12f./Soph.265c The Orator undermines the idea of fate by saying that it is τῆς φύσεως γεννησάσης: Plato makes reference to people who think that nature produces the world from an αἰτίας αὐτομάτης and not from God's workmanship. This is evidence to support the Orator's attack on the denial of providence, rather than the source of his statement here (compare Or.154.10f.).

2.19: Or.159.19-31/Tim.86dff.,Laws 904cff. The Orator argues that the doctrine of fate gives no support to virtue or justice; Plato argues that evil is due to diseases of the body and poor teaching (Tim.86dff.) which, while making evil actions blameless, is not the point of view represented in the Oration. He comes closer in suggesting that man's nature is decreed by fate (Laws.904cff.): but the generality of such an assertion means that no specific link between the Orator and Plato can be shown.

2.20: Or.160.24ff./Phdr.247c The vocabulary here is superficially similar: the Orator says that immortal things are understood νῷ...

μόνῳ since they are made by the νοητὴ...οὐσία θεοῦ: Plato says that reality is perceived μόνῳ...νῷ, which governs the soul. The Orator however is referring to the common Platonic distinction between νοητός and αἰσθητός (compare 164.9ff.), and is not quoting the Phaedrus.

2.21: Or.161.18/Cri.54d The Orator concludes chapter six by decrying αὐτόματον as ἦχος ὀνόματος ἀνυποστάτου περὶ τὰ ὦτα βομβεῖ: and Plato uses the phrase αὕτη ἡ ἠχὴ τούτων τῶν λόγων βομβεῖ. Both are rhetorical statements, with a context sufficiently dissimilar to make direct borrowing unlikely; the phrase ἠχὴ...βομβεῖ, like the English 'a ringing sound', could have been another common rhetorical phrase.

2.22: Or.162.1ff./Tim.60a Heikel (1911/13) suggested that the Orator drew his reference to vines and olives from their association in the Timaeus; but Psalm 104.15 would be a more plausible source than a technical discussion on liquids, and in any case the association of the two must have been common.

2.23: Or.165.7ff./Tim.40d The Orator says that the poets are to be believed when speaking of the gods through divine inspiration; Plato says that the poets as 'children of the gods' are to be credited with telling the truth about their parents. These arguments are both ironic, but the Orator speaks in the opposite way to Plato in proving the absurdity of paganism: there are no specific parallels.

2.24: Or.165.7ff/Laws 682a Plato says that a particular passage of Homer is historically correct, because the poets are often divinely inspired and speak the truth about history. Heikel[4] points to this passage in the Oration as a parallel, where the poets are ironically said to be trustworthy storytellers about the gods because of their divine inspiration. Plato is defending a serious historical source, while the Orator is using pagan poetry to argue against the reality of pagan gods. There is no connection of vocabulary, and the idea of the divine inspiration of the poets is used differently, making dependence unlikely.

2.25: Or.165.22/Soph.254a,Rep.533d The Orator uses the phrase τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμματι of the repentant man turning to God. Plato says that only a philosopher can see God τὰ γὰρ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ψυχῆς ὄμματα καρτερεῖν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀφορῶντα ἀδύνατα (Soph.254a), and also uses the phrase τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα (Rep.533d). Although the contexts in Plato and the Oration are different, the phrases are the same, suggesting that it was a familiar turn of speech rather than a proof of dependence.

2.26: Or.166.10/Rep.461c The Orator's decorative phrase καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἡμῖν μετρίως εἰρήσθω is similar to Plato's καὶ ταῦτα μέν γ', ἔφη, μετρίως λέγεται: but the contexts are very different, Plato's being a statement made by one partner in the discussion about another's proposal. As with the previous phrase discussed, the verbal similarity could well be due to a common rhetorical phrase and not direct borrowing, akin to the English 'all things in moderation'.

2.27: Or.166.22f./Apol.17b Both Plato and the Orator eschew oratory, in different words. That this is only rhetorical convention is shown by the similar passage in the prologue to Eusebius' laus (see above IV.2.2.2).

2.28: Or.168.19-22/Pol.273cff. The Orator says that the demiurge by nature will care for what he has made; Plato states that the world tended to disorder after separation from its creator, so that he stepped in to renew order. Plato does not however explain why the creator should intervene, nor why he withdrew from the world in the first place, and there is no similarity of expression to suggest dependence.

2.29: Or.169.7f. Heikel (1911/17) said that the thinking here was Platonic; the phrase νοητὸς κόσμος does not however occur in Plato, and the sentiments expressed are of general philosophical currency.

2.30: Or.169.18/Phdr.247c The Orator says of Christ, τίς γὰρ ἄν σε κατ' ἀξίαν ὑμνήσειεν ἄνθρωπος; Plato says of heaven, οὔτε τις ὕμνησέ πω τῶν τῇδε ποιητὴς οὔτε ποτὲ ὑμνήσει κατ' ἀξίαν. The sentiments are akin, and have some vocabulary in common; but if the Orator had quoted Plato directly, he would have followed the original more closely. A common sentiment is expressed independently by both authors.

2.31: Or.169.23/Soph.231d The Orator calls Christians the merchants of truly good things, and Plato compares the Sophist to a merchant of knowledge for the soul; the only common word between them is ἔμπορος, and the lack of similar vocabulary again argues for a well-used metaphor being found independently in both places.

2.32: Or.172.29f./Phdr.254c Both the Orator and Plato use the picture of a charioteer. But Plato's analogy is philosophically determined, in having a good and bad horse yoked together to represent the good and bad natures in man. The Orator on the other hand portrays the Christian as a charioteer controlling a runaway pair, a simpler and more natural illustration. There is no borrowing from Plato.

2.33: Or.173.12ff./Phdr.248aff. Plato and the Orator both say that only souls which aspire after God will reach heaven; there are only

general resemblances, and the division of mankind into the saved and the lost hardly has to depend on Plato!

2.34: Or.175.23f./Cri.48dff.,Gor.469b Plato says in both passages that Socrates renounced evil, saying that it was better to endure it; the Orator's sentiments are similar, but are in the context of the Saviour's actions and words which have already enjoined the acceptance of injury (174.20ff.), for which Heikel (1902/in loc.) quotes biblical and not Platonic sources.

2.35: Or.177.22f./Rep.600b The Orator says that Plato followed Pythagoras; Plato refers to Pythagoras respectfully, but says only that his disciples existed, and not that he himself was one. The association of Pythagoras and Plato occurs in other apologists, and was a theme taken from elsewhere, not from Plato himself (compare e.g.Ps.-Justin coh.Gr.14).

2.36: Or.189.12/Phd.67a Plato and the Orator maintain that godliness or knowledge comes from keeping the soul pure from the body; there is the same dualistic sentiment, but no similar wording, and the idea is too general to show dependence.

An assessment of the Orator's allusions to Plato thus shows no particular reasons to assume that he drew on Plato directly. There are some similarities of thought between Plato's works and the Oration (see above 2.4,12,19,20,23f.,33,36); there are similar rhetorical ideas (2.6,13,27,31,32) and similarities of phrasing (2.1,2,3,5,10,11, 21,26,30). But these would have been drawn by the author or translator of the Oration from a common stock of ideas and sayings, some of which were taken from Plato, and some from elsewhere. Similarity does not prove dependence, and Heikel and Pfättisch fail to show that the Orator has been dependent on Plato. Indeed, in one of the most 'Platonic' sections of the Oration, in chapter fourteen (173.15-23), they suggest no parallels at all, even to 173.21ff. with its Platonic contrast ὁ αἰσθητὸς κόσμος τῷ νοητῷ οὐδ' αἱ εἰκόνες τοῖς παραδείγμασιν (compare Tim.28a,29b,Or.164.9ff.). This reinforces the view that as far as minor allusions are concerned the Oration shows some similarities with Plato, but that these are due to the milieu in which it was written and not to direct borrowing. The similarities of phrasing however suggest that, if the Oration was not written in Greek, its translator must have exercised some independent judgment in choosing how to translate the Latin original into more acceptable rhetorical Greek.

3. PARALLELS OF SUBSTANCE

There are three major parallel passages yet to consider: two whose thought is said to be distinctly Platonic, and the discussion of Plato in chapter nine.

3.1: Or.3.1 (156.9-19)

Chapter three begins with a philosophical exposition of God and the Saviour. The introductory phrase Ἀγαθὸν οὗ πάντα ἐφίεται is taken directly from Aristotle eth.nic.1.1, despite the assertions of Pfättisch (1908/50;1910/412) to the contrary. Dörries (1954/159) pointed out that the following designation of God as ὑπὲρ τὴν οὐσίαν (156.9) also occurs in the specifically Platonic context of 163.19: but the phrase only occurs in Plato at Rep.372b, where families are said not to live 'beyond their means'; the nearest reference in a theological context is in Rep.509b, where τἀγαθόν is said not to be οὐσία, but ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας. The Pythagorean Moderatus (see Armstrong 1967/91f.) referred to God as ὑπὲρ τὸ εἶναι καὶ πᾶσαν οὐσίαν, suggesting that it was a philosophical designation which was found more widely than in Plato. The next phrase is taken from Tim.27d, τί τὸ ὂν ἀεί, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον, although the context is not the same, and it is developed in a way which appears Platonic while not having any direct connection with Plato (so Pfättisch 1910/411). Thus the Son's ἀναφορά is οὐ τοπικῶς ἀλλὰ νοερῶς (156.12f.), whereas Platonic thought would be inclined to use the contrast νοερῶς/αἰσθητῶς. The use of σπλάγχνια (156.13) of the Father's substance is also not Platonic.

Pfättisch (1908/51;1910/411) argued that the use of συνέστη (156.13) in the context of begetting is shown by Platonic parallels to be Plato's doctrine of the creation of the world applied specifically here to the Son of God, and supports this by referring to the use of συνέστη in chapter nine (164.14). But Plato uses συνίστημι at Tim.29d of the making of everything, not just the world, and later (30c) uses it in the sense of what 'comprises' the world; and it is used similarly elsewhere, e.g. in Aristotle eth.nic.6.7.4, ἐξ ὁ κόσμος συνέστηκεν. To take one word out of context to argue for a link with Plato is not valid, when its meaning here could simply be 'to take place' or 'to be' (see LS art.συνίστημι B.IV.d); its use in chapter nine likewise does not seem to be drawn from Plato. There are in any case numerous instances in Christian literature where συνίστημι is used of creation or begetting (see PGL art.συνίστημι I.B.2).

Heikel (1911/9) and Pfättisch (1908/50) ascribed the origin of ὅσα περιείληπται ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (156.16f.) to Tim.30c. which contains the words κόσμος, ὅσα, περιλαμβάνω, but in a different setting. The Orator states that the manifestation of the Saviour is the cause of all things which are included in the world; Plato says that the cosmos, which comprises all visible things, is patterned on the one living being which includes all intelligible things within itself. The Orator's statement is not quoting Plato, and the thought of the passage as a whole is different: the Orator is using the phrase to fill out a rather bare πᾶσιν, whereas Plato uses the similar words directly and not in a subordinate clause. There is no reason to see dependence.

Finally, Pfättisch (1908/50) suggested that the question τί οὖν δηλοῖ ὁ λόγος; (156.19) refers to Plato's argument, in the same way that τὸν ἀνεξέλεγκτον...λόγον (157.16f.) announces the intention of resuming the argument from a higher authority. It is true that Tim. 29b refers to ἀνελέγκτοις...λόγοις, but Plato also uses there the adjective ἀνικήτοις, which could have been quoted in the Oration if a literal reference was intended. In any case, Pfättisch interpreted λόγος to mean 'argument', because it fitted with his a priori view that Plato was being used; it makes better sense to translate it as 'reason(ing)', so that the Orator is saying that his reasoning concludes that there is one God, and at the end of the chapter that, having digressed into practical arguments, he will re-embark on philosophical reasoning which he regards as irrefutable. The Orator is not slavishly following Plato: rather, he has a naive delight in the power of logic and the truth of philosophy, and sees such truth as self-evidently supportive of Christianity. His grasp of philosophy here is superficial and eclectic, and is Platonic because of the general philosophical context in which it was written, not specifically in its content.

3.2: Or.11.8 (168.7-18)

This section on the generation of the Son is held by Pfättisch (1910/413f.) to be based on the Platonic doctrine of the νοῦς in the world-soul, since there is no reason in Christian theology why the Father could not have made the world without a mediator. This is however a fundamental misunderstanding of the argument: the Orator argues for Christ's pre-existence by blending together the philosophical argument that everything is caused by a prior agent with the theological point that Christ has procured the salvation of the world, and thus

that he must have existed before it; this is taken in passing to be an analogy of the Father causing the Son (168.17f.), but the connection between the pre-existent Christ and the Son as caused is not made explicit. The question about the generation of the Son (168.7f.) is answered obliquely by saying that it is different from natural generation, and is known by God's wise friends: it is not explained merely by saying that the Son is an effect of the Father. The Orator offers no clear explanation of the relationship between the Godhead and the world, and does not refer Plato's doctrine of creation to the relationship between the Father and the Logos.

There are two particular passages in Plato which are adduced as parallels here. Heikel (1911/17), Pfättisch (1908/60;1910/413) and Kurfess (1919-20/77) note that the Orator uses a phrase also found in Tim.53d, ἀνδρῶν ὃς ἂν ἐκείνῳ φίλος ᾖ, though with a different verb: ἀνδρῶν ὃς ἐκείνῳ φίλος ὑπάρχει (168.11f.). The difference in wording suggests, as Kurfess notes, that here is another example of a common literary phrase, included for rhetorical adornment with no direct borrowing from the Timaeus, where the argument is about triangles rather than generation. These scholars also suggest that the argument from causation is taken loosely from Tim.28a, where Plato says πᾶν δὲ αὖ τὸ γιγνόμενον ὑπ' αἰτίου τινὸς ἐξ ἀνάγκης γίγνεσθαι· παντὶ γὰρ ἀδύνατον χωρὶς αἰτίου γένεσιν σχεῖν. The vocabulary here is different from that of the Orator (168.13f.), who uses ἀναίτιος and the temporal word προϋπάρχειν, the latter being a stock Christian term (see PGL art.προϋπάρχω B.5); the argument from the priority of the cause is central in the Oration, but is absent from the Timaeus. Although a philosophical concept is at the root of the argument, the Orator is referring to a common argument on causation (compare Theophilus above, IV.4.1.10); there are insufficient parallels to show that this passage is dependent on Plato.

3.3: Or.9.2-7 (163.8-164.22)

Although there are no direct borrowings from Plato in the rest of the Oration, chapter nine at first sight seems to be different: the doctrines of Plato are specifically discussed and referred to. It is necessary to assess the argument section by section in order to see what conclusions can be drawn from this explicit reference to Plato.

3.3.1: 9.2 (163.8-15) The accusations against Socrates and Pythagoras are singular to the Oration, although both philosophers are referred to elsewhere in the apologists: thus Socrates is said to have been condemned for atheism (Justin,1 apol.5,2 apol.10;Tert.apol.14); Pythagoras got his knowledge from the Egyptians (Ps.-Justin coh.Gr.10,14; Lact.inst.4.2.4),[5] and was condemned for trying to usurp power (Arn. adv.nat.1.40). Only the Orator quotes against Socrates the charge which is specifically refuted in Plato's Apol.18b, τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιῶν: the wording is very different, and the accusation suggests that either the Orator had not read Plato and relied on hearsay, or that his memory was very faulty. In either case, he was not dependent on Plato.

3.3.2: 9.3 (163.15-25) The Platonic nature of the distinction between αἱ αἰσθήσεις and τὰ νοητά led Heikel (1902/in loc.) to propose two parallels: Phd.109df. is about seeing the world truly -- we cannot see heaven because of our ἀσθένεια: Phdr.249b says that man must progress from many αἰσθήσεων to a unity gained λογισμῷ. Neither are very close to the Orator's assertion that Plato took men's thoughts from sensible to intellectual and eternal things: that is a comment on Plato generally, rather than an allusion to any specific passage in his works.

The Orator goes on to say that Plato first showed θεὸν...τὸν ὑπὲρ τὴν οὐσίαν (163.18f.); as noted above (3.1), this is not a designation found in Plato, suggesting that the Orator is using a general summary of Plato's doctrines, and not one of his original works. The following statements (163.19-25) about the second god have been ascribed by Pfättisch (1910/405) and Heikel (1902/in loc.) to the creation of the cosmos in Tim.30, the First God being the demiurge (163.22), and the Second God occupying the place of Plato's ζῶον ἔμψυχον (Tim.30b). But Pfättisch (1910/405) also admits that the Orator's ideas of two gods sharing one perfection, and the second serving the first, are Christian and not Platonic.[6] The concept of two gods, while ascribed to Plato, is Middle Platonic, with the demiurge being usually identified with the highest good (compare Daniélou 1973/109f.). Although Numenius held that the second god was the demiurge (Places 1975/24,27;Armstrong 1967/100;Barnes 1981/74), the Orator followed Eusebius in being ambivalent about the nature of the second god (see Barnes 1981/100;compare Or.156.28); and other apologists used the idea to justify the truth of Christian theology (e.g.Lact.epit.37(42).4;Eus.p.e.11.16;compare Justin 1 apol.60f.; see Ogilvie 1978/80). The fact that Plato's works

can only be used very indirectly as a source for this idea, when it was already extant in Christian apologetics derived from Middle Platonism, together with the progression πρῶτον μὲν...ὑπέταξε δὲ (163.18f.) shows that the Orator was using a philosophical handbook on Plato, and not the works of Plato directly.

3.3.3: 9.4 (163.25-31) This section is an independent development of Plato's thought by the Orator, as indicated by the phrase κατὰ τὸν ἀκριβῆ λόγον (163.25): he relates Plato's doctrine of two gods to the Father and the Logos of Christian theology, using the philosophical designation of God as πατὴρ τῶν πάντων to justify the Logos being also the Son of God. Pfättisch (1908/57) tried to relate the ideas in this section to Plato: e.g. he referred God's taking care for the world to Phdr.246e, where Zeus is said to be διακοσμῶν πάντα καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος. But although the words are similar, there is no necessary dependence, but simply the common sentiment that God cares for the world. There is no incidence in the Timaeus of God arranging everything by his word; the nearest parallel is in 38c, which refers to God's reasoning behind creation, not to creation by word. It is only the epithet of God being Father of all that has a definite parallel in Plato: Tim.28c speaks of τὸν...ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα...τοῦ παντός. The designation of God as Father is not confined to Plato however; and in any case, the sentence in which it occurs is widely quoted in the apologists and Middle Platonic philosophers (compare Daniélou 1973/108). There is nothing in this section to suggest that the Orator was using Plato except for this one commonly quoted phrase.

3.3.4: 9.5 (163.31-164.6) The Orator continues by attacking Plato's error in introducing many gods with different forms, and its bad influence on mankind. The μέχρι...τούτου...ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἑξῆς (163.31f.) at the beginning of the section is held by Pfättisch (1910/406) and Kurfess (1919-20/74) to refer to Tim.39e-42e. This could have provided the basis for the Orator's statement; but if he was using the Timaeus on its own, it would have been odd if he had skipped straight from 28c to 39e. If however he was using a philosophical compendium or handbook on Plato, it would be logical for a summary to treat of God, the Logos, and then the gods and the world; if the following sections were also taken from such a handbook, then we can assume that it went on to consider Plato's doctrines of the soul and judgment. From the evidence of this section alone, however, all we can conclude is that the Orator

probably refers to the doctrine of the Timaeus, but most likely at second hand.

3.3.5: 9.6 (164.6-15) Plato's former error is 'put right' for the Orator by his doctrine of the soul: Kurfess (1919-20/75) says that δοκεῖ...μοι (164.6) shows that this is the Orator's own opinion, and is not taken from his sources; which is wholly likely, given that Plato's doctrine of the soul has no effect on his doctrine of the gods! The author's philosophical naivety surfaces again here. The doctrine that 'God breathes into us his own Logos', which is taken to imply that the Spirit of God is rational soul, has some parallel with Tim.41cff.,69c, where the soul is immortal and made by gods; but according to Plato it is then linked with what is mortal by the lesser gods, not breathed into man on the pattern of Genesis 2.7. If the Orator is expounding Plato, he must be giving an interpretive summary and not an exact reference. The division into νοητόν τε καὶ αἰσθητόν (164.9f.) is touched on in Tim.27dff. in relation to creation, not to the soul; this whole section also seems to be a summary of Plato's doctrine, not an exposition of particular passages in Plato. There are traces of common thinking between Plato and the Orator: Tim.41b/Or.164.12 say the soul is ἄλυτος: Tim.41c,Phdr.245c,Phd.114d/Or.164.13 uphold the immortality of the soul; Phd.78c/Or.164.12 say that what is ἀξύνθετον will endure; Phd.79a/Or.164.11 distinguish between things accessible to the intellect and things seen by the senses. But there is no one passage in Plato which accounts for these statements, suggesting that they are based on a general summary of Plato's doctrines.

3.3.6: 9.7 (164.15-22) The judgment of souls is ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς (164.15), the Orator again indicating another section in the handbook to which he refers. The concept that souls which live well will go to heaven is echoed in Tim.42b, but in the context of the transmigration of souls, which the Orator wholly ignores. There is a closer parallel in Phd.114b, which says that those who live ὁσίως (compare 164.16) will escape hell and may get to heaven. Pfättisch (1910/408f.) plausibly suggests that the comment ἀλλὰ καὶ βιωφελῶς (164.18) represents the Orator's own opinion that this doctrine is morally useful as well as philosophically attractive; and he also says that ἀκολούθως δὲ τούτοις (164.20f.) marks the author moving from Tim.42b to Phd.113f., showing his familiarity with Plato, whereas Kurfess (1919-20/75f.) preferred the idea that the Orator knew the Timaeus (in Latin), but used a

secondary source for other Platonic material. Thus for Kurfess the comment at 164.20f. indicates the use of a Christian compendium in which the doctrine of transmigration was suppressed, and in its place was put the punishment of evil from the Phaedo.

After considering the relationship between chapter nine of the Oration and the works of Plato, we disagree with Kurfess' conclusion that the Orator uses the Timaeus, a conclusion he himself later played down (1949/172n.10), and also with Pfättisch's view that he was at home in the works of Plato. On the contrary, he appears to take a few thoughts drawn from Plato by some other author who summarised his doctrine, and develops them in a superficially Christian and philosophical manner, while ingenuously referring to his handbook as though it were in front of his listeners or readers too. It is doubtful whether this was a compendium of quotations, since the references to Plato's points in the chapter are not very closely parallel, suggesting that the Orator's source was a secondary summary of Platonic doctrine made by a writer influenced by Middle Platonism. It is also doubtful, as against Kurfess, that it was a Christian compendium, since it referred to Plato's doctrines about the gods: the Orator could have omitted transmigration as irrelevant to his purposes, since Plato provided a more acceptable alternative doctrine of the soul. There is no reason why such a philosophical overview of Plato could not have been made by a philosophically inclined Christian, summarising with one eye on Christian doctrine, or even specially commissioned by Constantine -- but that it to move from deduction to conjecture.

4. THE CHRISTIAN CONTEXT OF PLATO

In order to put the Oration's relationship to the works of Plato into perspective, it is necessary to consider how it relates to the works of the apologists and Eusebius.

4.1: The apologists

One standard apologetic view of Plato was that he owed the key elements of his philosophical system to Moses. Thus Justin (1 apol.60) states that Tim.36bf., which refers to the world being created crosswise, was derived from Moses' serpent on a pole; Ps.-Justin (coh.Gr.10, 14) maintains Plato's dependence on Moses, and generally tries to relate Platonic doctrines to the Bible. The apologists could then use

Plato to support Christian doctrine, and used among others similar passages to those apparently referred to at second hand by the Orator: so Athenagoras (leg.19.2) refers to Tim.27d on the distinction between what is eternal and imperishable and what comes to be, in showing the implausibility of the myths about the gods. Latin as well as Greek writers use the popular Tim.28c on the difficulty of knowing God (e.g. Min.Felix oct.19;Tert.apol.46.9); Tim.53d on men who are dear to God is referred to by Ps.-Justin (coh.Gr.26); Plato's views on judgment are mentioned by Justin (1 apol.8.4), Tatian (orat.6) and Athenagoras (leg.12.2); and Phd.112ff., which refers to Acheron and Pyriphlegethon (compare 164.21f.) is alluded to by Clement (str.5.14.91). There was an established set of arguments about how Plato related to Christianity on which the Orator could draw, and these arguments were general as well as specific: e.g. Clement (str.5.14.93,p.387.21f.) refers to the distinction between the noetic and sensible realms as one that was common in barbarian philosophy: κόσμον τε αὖθις τὸν μὲν νοητὸν οἶδεν ἡ βάρβαρος φιλοσοφία, τὸν δὲ αἰσθητόν. That this distinction was known elsewhere is shown by Eusebius' quotation of this passage from Clement (p.e.11.25.1). Although authors such as the Greek Clement and the Latin Arnobius could refer to Plato in the original (see McCracken 1949/37), other Christian writers less skilled in philosophy made reference to compendia, as Athenagoras (leg.6.2) openly admits, and as analysts of Lactantius have concluded for his writings (so Kurfess 1923/391f.;Ogilvie 1978/109). Daniélou's analysis (1973/107-23) of the relationship between some of the apologists and Middle Platonism held that the Christian writers made use of passages in Plato which were in vogue in their contemporary philosophy, as well as using Middle Platonic exegesis in their arguments. Thus the occurrence in the Oration of isolated themes found in Plato and given in a summarised form, set in a general background of thought influenced by Middle Platonism, is coherent with it having been written by an unphilosophical apologist working within the Christian tradition. The lack of space given to Plato and the philosophers in general, when compared with other apologetic works, fits with the overall approach of an oration whose scope was limited.

4.2: Eusebius

The comparison of Platonic and biblical doctrines on God, the soul, the world and judgment was the particular concern of Eusebius' p.e.11. The very order of his themes fits generally with the Orator's

treatment of Plato's doctrines, and there are several connections between the two writers.

4.2.1: Tim.27d A passage in Eusebius is very similar to Or.164.8-11:

> τούτοις δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν ἀκολούθως εἰς δύο τὸ πᾶν διαιρούντων, εἴς τε νοητὸν καὶ αἰσθητόν, καὶ τὸ μὲν νοητὸν ἀσώματον καὶ λογικὸν τὴν φύσιν ἄφθαρτόν τε καὶ ἀθάνατον εἶναι ὁριζομένων, τὸ δ' αἰσθητὸν ἐν ῥύσει καὶ φθορᾷ μεταβολῇ τε καὶ τροπῇ τῆς οὐσίας ὑπάρχειν. (p.e. 11.9.3,p.24.10-13)

The fact that the Orator was not dependent on this passage is shown both by the differences in vocabulary and in the different way in which the reference to Tim.27d is used, referring for Eusebius to the nature of the world, and for the Orator to the soul and the body. It is however important to note that possibly contemporary authors could have similar ways of summarising a particular passage of Plato.

4.2.2: Two gods The doctrine of two gods in the Oration is said by Barnes (1981/74) to be drawn from Numenius, whose work Περὶ τἀγαθοῦ is quoted in p.e.11.10,18. Eusebius (p.e.11.16.3) glosses the Ps.-Platonic Ep.6.323c as showing that the second god is the demiurge, which agrees with Numenius (p.e.11.18.6), but not with the Orator (Or.163.22f.). Numenius' doctrine that the second god is concerned with the sensible world (p.e.11.18.4f.) is perhaps echoed in Or.156.14ff., although Numenius' distinction between the first self-contemplative god and the active second god is not followed; thus Or.163.22-5 speaks of the second god obeying the creator's commands. If the Orator had been dependent on Numenius, especially as presented in Eusebius, a closer connection in thinking would have been apparent: e.g. the Orator's tortuous explanation of the manifestation of the Saviour (156.11-16) is not at all close to Numenius' simple analogy of a light being kindled (p.e.11.18.15). The 'two gods' doctrine of Plato in the Oration is based generally on Middle Platonic thinking, and not on Eusebius.

4.2.3: Soul Eusebius (p.e.11.27) quotes Phd.79aff. on the soul, with some sentiments similar to those in Or.164.9-15; but if the Orator had been dependent on this, he would surely have used the Platonic designation of the soul as ἀσωμάτος καὶ ἀφανῆς, with which Eusebius summarises Plato's ideas (p.e.11.28.18,p.65.22).

4.2.4: Causation The argument from causation in Or.168.13f. echoes a sentence in Tim.28a, which is quoted in p.e.11.29.2, showing that it was a well-known saying of Plato. Here however it is in the context

of Eusebius affirming the creation of the world, not the begetting of the Son.

4.2.5: Eternity On judgment and the afterlife, Eusebius, like the Orator, ignores metempsychosis at this juncture, quoting Phd.113a in p.e.11.38. Like the Orator he picks out Plato's nearest approach to Christian doctrine.

4.2.6: Polytheism It is however interesting to note that, unlike chapter nine of the Oration, Eusebius ignores Plato's polytheism in p.e.11; later on (13.1-5) he interprets Tim.40d and other passages of Plato as showing his contempt for pagan religion, but then (13.14) takes them straightforwardly as showing his idolatry. The Orator's view of Plato is simpler.

4.2.7: Error In attacking Plato's mistakes, Eusebius says (p.e.13.16.1,p.234.4) that Plato is wrong to say that the essence of the soul is σύνθετον: and the Orator includes in his list of the soul's attributes its nature as ἀσύνθετον (164.12). In the rest of p.e.13.16, Eusebius points out the inconsistency between Plato's doctrines of judgment and metempsychosis, being more honest about Plato's doctrines than is the Orator.

4.2.8: πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως Eusebius (p.e.15.6.4) quotes Atticus as giving the sentence in Tim.30a which contains this phrase, showing that it was a known and quoted saying of Plato: the phrase would have been available for use in the Oration as part of the philosophical and literary currency of the time.

It is then apparent, as against Schwartz (1908/3098), that the Orator was not dependent for his knowledge of Plato on the works of Eusebius. The parallels with Plato in the Oration can be explained as part of the philosophical context of the period in which it was composed, which the author and translator made use of in preparing the present text of the Oration.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1: Substance

As far as the thought of the Oration is concerned, the Orator drew on a summary of Platonic doctrines and a general background of eclectic philosophical thinking which owed something to Middle Platonism. Attempts to pin down the Orator's sources in Plato or Eusebius have

failed; Barnes' suggestion (1981/74) that Constantine drew on Calcidius' commentary on the Timaeus is equally speculative, as he provides no specific parallels, and in any case admits that Calcidius gleaned his ideas from other Middle Platonists (compare Dillon 1977/401-8). Any similarity between the Oration and Calcidius' work simply shows a similar philosophical context. The superficial philosophy found in the Oration argues against it having been written by an original mind which independently brought together Plato and later philosophical thought.

5.2: Form

The use of some apparently Platonic words and phrases in the text of the Oration is due to the translator leaning towards a Greek rhetorical style which drew on a common stock of literary phrases. There are similarities of rhetorical device which could be due to either author or translator, but which are sufficiently integrated into the text to be considered as the work of the author, whose general education would have included instruction in the preparation of speeches. Thus Pfättisch (1910/416) is wrong to deny, against Schwartz, that the Oration is a translation from a Latin original, decorated with Platonic expressions; the unified nature of the Oration is not affected by the superficial use of some literary phrases. The very superficiality of them is itself an indication that the Oration was not written in Greek by someone conversant with Plato.

5.3: v.C.4.32

This second conclusion does however raise a further question: why should a Latin oration have been translated with a Greek rhetorical style, if it was intended to be read not spoken? Why was it not translated literally, as the commentary on the Fourth Eclogue appears to have been (see above II.5.2)? Part of the answer may lie in Pfättisch's observation (1908/64) that there are very few Platonic reminiscences after chapter fifteen, which may be due to a different translator as well as different subject matter. But more important is a correct understanding of what Eusebius says about the Oration in v.C. 4.32. It has generally been assumed by scholars who believe in the Constantinian authorship of the Oration that the emperor delivered an oration in Latin which was then translated and/or adapted, for various reasons.[7] But Eusebius' statement does not say that Constantine delivered his orations in Latin, but only that he wrote them in Latin,

and that appointed interpreters changed the writing into Greek: Ῥωμαΐᾳ μὲν οὖν γλώττῃ τὴν τῶν λόγων συγγραφὴν βασιλεὺς παρεῖχε. μετέβαλλον δ' αὐτὴν Ἑλλάδι μεθερμηνευταὶ φωνῇ οἷς τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἔργον ἦν (p.132. 11f.). Millar (1977/204ff.,226) points out that Augustus would write a Greek speech in Latin and then have it translated, because of the higher standard of language demanded in rhetoric. Although Millar regards v.C.4.32 as ambiguous, meaning that either Constantine delivered his speeches in Greek, or that they were given in Latin and simultaneously translated (as at Nicaea,v.C.3.13), the text appears to fit the Augustinian model of a written translation better. Thus Constantine delivered the Oration in Greek, not Latin, and it was translated with superficial rhetorical touches in order for it to appear more rhetorically accomplished. This also explains why παῖς was used as in Eusebius' Greek orations (see above IV.6.5.2). Rather than the Oration being a Latin speech especially translated for propaganda purposes, it was an ordinary imperial oration which Eusebius obtained from the chancellery as a specimen of Constantine's work, and was only one of the many discourses which Constantine wrote in Latin and delivered in Greek.[8]

This view of Eusebius' statement helps to elucidate the question of how much Greek language and thinking Constantine was familiar with. Rossignol (1845/304ff.) denied that Constantine knew much Greek language or thought, while Mancini (1894/97ff.), supported by Barnes (1981/73f.), said that he knew Greek but preferred Latin as his birth language. Eusebius in the v.C. emphasises Constantine's learning (e.g.1.19, 3.59,4.29,55), and makes four other references of significance for showing the emperor's preference for language. In one of his letters to Eusebius (4.35), Constantine indicates that he had Eusebius' tract on Easter translated into Latin, showing that he preferred to do his theological reading in that language. The orations that Eusebius delivered to Constantine (4.33,46) were however in Greek, showing that Constantine was quite capable of listening to a long Greek oration on theology. Eusebius' comments about Nicaea show both these sides of Constantine: he delivered his introductory address in Latin, but participated in the discussion in Greek. The statement that Constantine spoke συναγαγὼν αὐτὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν τὴν διάνοιαν (3.11,p.87.2f.) suggests that he was speaking impromptu, and therefore used Latin as the language in which he could think most easily;[9] just as he wrote the Oration in Latin because he thought in it and could read it more easily, but was capable of speaking it in Greek. The Eusebian style of the Nicene

Oration in v.C.3.12 (compare Heikel 1902/lxiii) suggests it was a reconstruction by Eusebius from notes rather than a verbatim report of a speech made by Constantine in Greek. Finally, in v.C.2.47.2 Eusebius states that Constantine's letter to the Provincials has been translated from a Latin original which was written in the emperor's own hand (αὐτόγραφος,p.68.12): Constantine would not have written to the peoples of the Eastern Empire in Latin, nor would he have produced his own copies. The implication is that Eusebius was using the original draft of the letter, which he found in the imperial chancellery, and therefore Constantine did his drafting in Latin, with the Oration being no exception.

A consideration of Plato in the Oration thus strengthens the conclusion that the evaluation of the Oration's relationship to other possible sources has already revealed: there is no evidence to show that the Oration is dependent on any particular source, but there are indications that its contents and form support the identification of the Orator as Constantine. That identification has now to be tested.

CHAPTER VI - THE ORATION AND THE WORKS OF CONSTANTINE

BOOKLIST

Barnes,T.D. Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

Baynes,N.H. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church, (London, 1931).

Courcelle,P. 'Les Exégèses Chrétiennes de la quatrième eclogue', Revue des Études Anciennes, 59 (1957) 294-319.

Dölger,F.J. ΙΧΘΥΣ 1 Band. Das Fisch-Symbol in Frühchristlicher Zeit (Rome,1910).

Dörries,H. Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins (Göttingen,1954).

--- Constantine and Religious Liberty, translated by R.H.Bainton (New Haven USA,1960).

Grillmeier,A. Christ in Christian Tradition, second edition, vol.1 (London,1975).

Hanson,R.P.C. 'The "Oratio ad Sanctos" attributed to the Emperor Constantine and the oracle at Daphne', Journal of Theological Studies, 24 (1973) 505-11.

Harnack,A. Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, 3 vols (Leipzig,1893-1904) II.2 (1904).

Hartmann,W. Konstantin der Grosse als Christ und Philosoph in seinen Briefen und Erlassen, Beilage zum Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde (Fürstenwalde,1902).

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius 1, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beitrage zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Heim,F. 'L'influence exercée par Constantin sur Lactance: sa théologie de la victoire', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978) pp.55-74.

Kelly,J.N.D. Early Christian Creeds, third edition (London,1972).

Kraft,H. 'ΟΜΟΟΥΣΙΟΣ', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 66 (1954-5) 1-24.

--- Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung, Beitrage zur historischen Theologie 20 (Tübingen,1955).

Kurfess,A. 'Platos Timaeus in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 19 (1919-20) 72-81.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologie und Glaube, 39 (1949) 167-74.

Lietzmann,H. From Constantine to Julian, A History of the Early Church, translated by B.L.Woolf, second edition, 4 vols (London,1953) III.

Mancini,A. 'La Pretesa Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum', Studi Storici, 3 (1894) 92-117, 207-28.

Millar,F. The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.-A.D.337) (London, 1977).

Pfättisch,J.M. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

---- 'Die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', in ed. Dölger,F.J., Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, Supplementheft der Römischen Quartalschrift, 19 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1913a) pp.96-121.

Prestige,G.L. God in Patristic Thought, second edition (London,1952).

Rauschen,G. 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Literarische Rundschau für das katholische Detschland, 36 (1910) 68-70.

Stead,G.C. Divine Substance (Oxford,1977).

Wendland,P. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen: Eusebius Werke 1, hrsg. von I. Heikel usw.', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 22 (1902) 225-36.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1: Studies

If no clear indications of the identity of the Orator are given by enquiring into the possible sources of his material, is it possible to establish whether or not Constantine was the author of the Oration by comparing it with his known works? Most writers on the Oration have adopted this approach to the question. Mancini (1894/219-22) looked at correspondences between the Oration and letters in the v.C., and concluded that a forger of the Oration had used Constantinian materials; Heikel (1902/cif.) accepted some of his correspondences and added some of his own, ascribing them to a superficial use of Constantine's letters by a later forger. Hartmann (1902/32) suggested some themes that were common to the Orator and the Constantinian letters, but then picked out three superficial differences to show that Constantine could not in fact have been the Orator. Pfättisch (1908/78-86, 91-106) looked at a wider selection of Constantian material, including the Gelasian Oration to Nicaea, and concluded that resemblances between them and the Oration were more than merely superficial: he held however that the similarities were due, not to the personal authorship of Constantine, but to the activities of a Greek reviser of his drafts, who worked on the Oration as well as on many of his other documents. The only detailed comparison between the Oration and all of Constantine's works, by Dörries (1954/147-61), concluded that the similarities of thought and style were so great that Constantine must have written the Oration, with the rider that he may have had secretarial help with the content as well as the form of the Oration. Kraft (1955/271f.) accepted most of Dörries' parallels, but maintained that differences between the Oration and the Constantinian documents showed that there was only a Constantinian kernel in the Oration, which was altered much more than in other documents; his socalled 'decisive' differences -- that Constantine does not quote, does not use the name 'Christ', and regards nature in a different way from the Orator -- are however dependent on a selective use of Constantinian material (see below 1.3).

1.2: Limitations

The general conclusions of scholars have thus been that there are similarities between the Oration and the Constantinian corpus, and some apparent differences; this conclusion being held to show either a borrowing of Constantine's ideas by a later author, or a substantial re-writing by a reviser, or the effective authorship of the Oration by

Constantine. This chapter is concerned to explore the extent of the verbal and conceptual parallels between the Oration and the Constantinian documents, with the limitations of such an enquiry being clearly recognised. Preceding chapters have considered whether particular texts were used by the Orator as sources: this chapter has a different intention, i.e. to see whether what is written in the Oration is consistent with its having been written by the author of the Constantinian documents. The question is not whether a passage in the Oration is the same as a passage in Constantine, but rather whether one person could have written both passages. There are three particular points to bear in mind, which have not always been acknowledged by the scholars referred to above.

1.2.1: Verbal/conceptual There is a necessary distinction between verbal parallels, i.e. similarities of word or phrase, and parallels of thought -- as with the inquiry into the relationship between the Oration and Plato. Are verbal parallels exact, or apparently coincidental? Are they substantial parallels or merely cosmetic, as Heikel suggested? Are they due to a common chancellery style (so Heikel 1902/lxviiif.), not to a common author?

1.2.2: Translation In considering verbal parallels, it is necessary to take into account -- as none of the above scholars do -- the fact that the works of Constantine in Greek may be translated from the Latin by different people, and further, that Constantine may have composed some of his letters directly in Greek and not Latin. For example, v.C.2.23 and 2.45 seem to imply official translations, while 2.47 and 4.8 imply a special translation made by or for Eusebius, and 3.16 suggests a letter written, if not composed, by Constantine in Greek. Moreover, v.C.4.32 refers to the translators of Constantine's discourses, of which the Oration is a specimen, as those οἷς τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἔργον ἦν (p.132.12), which appears to mean that there were special translators for orations, presumably more adept at making a rhetorical Greek translation. It is then not possible simply to compare the phrasing of the Oration with that of other Constantinian documents: although the ideas in them were presumably translated as correctly as possible, the exact wording could differ according to the translator, and Constantine's Greek may have been different again. Similar phrases may or may not reflect an identical underlying Latin word. Verbal parallels between the Oration and the works of Constan-

tine need to be assessed very carefully, as do verbal differences.

1.2.3: Context The particular circumstances in which the documents were written influences their content. Constantine's stress on the unity of the church is in the context of the Donatist and Arian disputes; his more eirenic approach to paganism is part of his desire to unite the different peoples of the Empire under his rule. A comparison between the Orator's apology for the Christian faith and the concerns and asides of letters written in particular situations has to be done with care, not claiming too much for apparent differences: as Dörries (1954/31) pointed out, it is unfair to expect theological precision in the official rhetoric of an imperial letter.

1.3: Dubious works

Given these limitations, it is necessary to evaluate the verbal and conceptual parallels between the Oration and the works of Constantine. Before so doing however, a definition has to be given of what those works are. The documents, laws and inscriptions assessed by Dörries (1954/16-128,162-226) are generally those accepted as genuine; but Kraft's analysis (1955/160-270) raises questions about some of them. In this chapter Dörries' list has been accepted, but it is necessary to note Kraft's comments in order to justify this acceptance. There are five documents in question.

1.3.1: to the Synod of Arles (Opt.app.V) Kraft (pp.185-91) held this to be partially genuine, excising the references to 'Christ' in order to support his contention (p.272) that Constantine virtually never uses it. But there is no textual support for his piecemeal division of the letter into genuine and spurious parts, and to do so on *a priori* grounds is not acceptable. The letter should be taken as wholly genuine.

1.3.2: the Oration to Nicaea (Eus.*v.C.*3.12; Gel.*h.e.*2.7.1-41) Dörries (1954/62-6) uses both the Eusebian and Gelasian versions, apparently regarding the former as verbally genuine and the latter as Constantinian in ideas, even if not genuinely Nicene. Kraft (pp.268ff.) pointed with Heikel (1902/lxiii) to the Eusebian style and Constantinian ideas of the Eusebian speech as evidence that it was a free rendering by Eusebius from notes of Constantine's speech. He suggested that the Gelasian oration was taken from Dalmatius and used by Gelasius

in the context of Nicaea because of its title, πρὸς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον (p.46.5), with the last chapter added on as a conclusion which applied specifically to Nicaea. His conclusion is attractive, while needing more detailed analysis: for example, is it significant that omnipotens is translated in two different ways?[1] It is however possible to treat both the Eusebian and Gelasian speeches as genuine, while being cautious about the wording of Eusebius' version, and unsure of the context and audience of the Gelasian oration, which nonetheless should be taken as authentically Constantinian.

1.3.3: to the Nicomedians (Op.3,27) Kraft (pp.228f.) thought that the first five sections of this letter were genuine, while being possibly taken from a separate theological oration, and that the second half was genuine; but he doubted the authenticity of sections 6-9, especially the polemic against Arius, although he acknowledged that there were Constantinian ideas in those sections. Constantine is capable elsewhere of discursive introductions to letters and strong language against his opponents (e.g. the letter to the Synod of Arles); there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the letter as a whole.

1.3.4: the Edict against Arius (Op.3,33) Kraft (pp.231ff.) considers this to be a forgery by Athanasius, given the disagreements of the different versions of the edict and its incongruity of order. These differences are however not surprising if the edict was disseminated throughout the Empire, and the order is not incongruous. It was not beyond Constantine to promulgate such an edict, even if it was not rigorously applied.

1.3.5: to Arius (Op.3,34) Dörries (1954/108n.2) quotes Baynes' comment regarding this work, that 'it is so improbable that for that very reason it is impossible to regard it as a forgery'. Kraft (pp.239-42) however holds the letter to be only partly genuine, with Constantine writing the eirenic parts and another author, possibly Athanasius, interpolating the polemic. He gives three reasons.

1.3.5.1: Polemic Constantine did not write polemically. This is an *a priori* assumption which affects his view of the letters noted above; but if Constantine was capable of polemic, as the letters in fact suggest, then this reason is inadequate. Dörries (1960/120n.9) disa-

greed with dividing up the letter on this basis, holding it to be of uniform quality.

1.3.5.2: Mythology Constantine does not use mythology or sources, while the letter refers to Ares and Aphrodite, and quotes the Sibyl based on a Latin version (Op.3,34.6,19). But the mythological references are made in passing in order to insult, based on the pun 'Ares Arius' (Op.3,34.6, compare .38); and the view that Constantine does not use sources is again a priori, not borne out by the evidence here.

1.3.5.3: Context The letter does not fit into its stated historical context. The note after the letter (Op.3,34.43) which states that it was read in Alexandria under Paterius, who was prefect in 333, does not fit with Arius being in Constantinople in that year; the letter assumes he is in Libya, and that he is threatening schism, while he was only formally excommunicated for the two years after Nicaea. Kraft is here again allowing his assumptions to dictate to the evidence: the letter is itself evidence for the presence of Arius in Libya in 332-3, threatening secession because of not being re-admitted to the Catholic church, which provoked Constantine to intemperate wrath (so e.g. Barnes 1981/232f.). The letter's imperfections are evidence of its author's rage rather than of a later forgery. Dörries (1960/ 120n.9) quotes Epiphanius (haer.69.9.3) where this letter is said to be a general encyclical to the whole Empire, written with wisdom and zeal: its address to Arius and those with him and its use of the second person do not however suggest an encyclical, but a personal letter; possibly Epiphanius exaggerated its importance for his own purposes.

There seems then no reason to doubt the substantial authenticity of these documents. Kraft's objections seem to be mainly a priori and not based on secure evidence. How does the Oration compare to these and the other works of Constantine?

2. VERBAL PARALLELS

Heikel (1902/cii) made some general remarks on the similarities of style between the Oration and the Constantinian documents; Pfättisch (1908/78-82) suggested numerous parallels between them; and Dörries (1954/153-8) looked at thirty-nine particular words and phrases which they had in common. Most of Pfättisch's parallels are either not valid, or merely general similarities of idea; Dörries' references are correct, but prove less than he maintains. Instead of getting immersed in the detail of hundreds of possible parallels, it is preferable to look at the best two of Pfättisch's verbal similarities and five of Dörries' proposals, in order to see what they show; and then to put forward some alternative suggestions.

2.1: Parallels already proposed

2.1.1: Or.167.20f./v.C.2.24 Pfättisch pointed out the similarity of the Orator's τὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν παραίτιον πάντων. Χριστόν to Constantine's τὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν αἴτιον θεόν (p.58.20f.). But at best this indicates only a similar way of thinking about God: not only is the precise wording different, but the Orator is speaking of Christ and uses the phrase to describe him, whereas for Constantine it is an essential reason why men should worship God. The idea that God is the source of what is good can hardly have been peculiar to Constantine; this similarity of phrasing thus cannot show that the same person was responsible for both works.

2.1.2: Or.160.2/v.C.4.42 Pfättisch (pp.83f.) tried to show that Plato was a source for Constantine as well as the Orator, but without success.[2] However, he also pointed out that the Orator's μόνον οὐχὶ φωνὴν ἀφιέντων is virtually the same as Constantine's μόνον οὐχὶ φωνὴν ἀφιεὶς (p.137.17f.), which in turn is identical with Demosthenes or.1.2. Both the Orator and Constantine use the phrase for decoration: it could have been due to the same author or translator working on both documents; but it could simply have been a widely-used turn of phrase, as its use in Eus.p.e.1.3.9 suggests (see above IV.2.4.2).

2.1.3: εὐτυχία Dörries points out that the prosperity of Israel is said in the Oration to depend on the work of Moses (177.17), just as in the letter to Anullinus (Eus.h.e.10.7.1,p.891.7) Roman prosperity depends on the right cult. But εὐτυχία also occurs in the letter to Antioch (v.C.3.60,p.113.5) with no reference to right worship; and in

any case the Orator in referring to the work of Moses emphasises his leadership into freedom rather than the establishment of right worship. It is difficult to see any necessary connection between Constantine and the Orator on the basis of this word.

2.1.4: γνώμη This occurs once in the Oration (155.2) to describe the will of impious princes. Dörries compares this with the ἀσεβὴς γνώμη of v.C.2.24(p.58.19). However, γνώμη occurs three other times in this letter, and is relatively frequent in Constantine's other letters.[3] What is more surprising is that it only occurs once in the Oration; if this is also by Constantine, the word might have been expected to have been more frequent. This is an example of the limited nature of Dörries' parallels: concerned to find words and phrases common to the Oration and the Constantinian documents, he overlooks the limited nature of his similarities.

2.1.5: ὁμόνοια The Orator uses this concept to describe the world being in harmony (156.25), the unity of the church (189.2), and unity among political leaders (191.5). Dörries is correct to note that this word occurs in many Constantinian documents; but Constantine refers it mainly to the need for unity in church affairs, and never to harmony in creation. There is a question of translation here: is there a consistent underlying concordia (compare to Aelafius,Opt.app.III, p.206.22; to Celsus,Opt.app.VII,p.212.12), translated as ὁμόνοια (to Chrestus,Eus.h.e.10.5.24,p.890.1) in the letters and the Oration? What of ἁρμονία, which occurs both in the Oration (e.g. 161.2) and in Constantine (e.g.to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.69,p.75.25)? The word ὁμόνοια of itself does not show a necessary connection between the Orator and Constantine; and the particularly Constantinian stress on unity does not have much echo in the Oration. This may be due to the absence of reference to ecclesiastical conflict in the Oration, just as there is no obvious context in the letters of Constantine for the use of ὁμόνοια referring to creation. But it would have been a much stronger indication of Constantinian authorship to have found a reference to concord, especially in the church, at the end of the Oration where the Orator refers to the prosperity of public affairs. There is no inconsistency of use between Constantine and the Orator, but no pressing similarity either.

2.1.6: ὑπηρεσία Dörries points out that the Orator's reference to τὴν ἐμὴν ὑπηρεσίαν (p.192.7) finds correspondences in three Constantinian letters: the same phrase occurs in the letter to the Orientals (v.C.2.28,p.60.7) in the same context, and similar uses are found in the letter to Alexander and Arius (v.C.2.71,p.77.18) and Eusebius (v.C.2.46,p.67.15). The word is used twice elsewhere in Constantine with a different sense,[4] not qualified by a possessive adjective. This is an example of a verbal parallel which could be due to the usage of a single author, and thus indicate a close connection between the Orator and Constantine.

2.1.7: κατὰ φύσιν The phrase which occurs at the beginning of the Oration (154.12) is also noted by Dörries as occuring in the letter to the Provincials (v.C.2.56,p.71.7). Dörries has however omitted to notice that the phrase occurs earlier in the letter (v.C.2.51,p.69.24); if it was translated by Eusebius, this fits with his usage elsewhere (see above IV.2.4.1). Heikel (1902/lxii) remarks on Constantine's obscurity, a remark which could also be applied to the Orator. Constantine uses the phrase again in the letter to the Catholic Alexandrians in an equally obscure fashion (Athan.apol.61.3,p.141.20f.). Any parallel here lies perhaps in unclear expression rather than the use of a not uncommon identical phrase.

2.2: Suggested similarities

If the parallels put forward by other authors are inconclusive, can any more certain conclusion be reached? Short of undertaking a full computer analysis of Constantinian vocabulary, which even then would be subject to the limitations of the documents having had different translators, there can be no pretensions to this being a final analysis of verbal parallels between Constantine and the Orator. It is helpful however to look at such parallels in three ways: to compare similarities or differences in particular words or phrases which have become apparent in reading through the Constantinian documents; to look at particular themes and metaphors and their use of vocabulary; and to look at the terms used for God, which provide the widest set of comparative vocabulary in the Oration and the Constantinian documents.

2.2.1: Words

2.2.1.1: μάλιστα/ἐξαιρέτως Constantine makes frequent use of μάλιστα as an adverb; ἐξαιρέτως occurs in conjunction with it in the Oration

to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.21,p.49.20) and on its own in the letters to the Tyre bishops (Athan.apol.86.12,p.165.32), the Palestinian bishops (v.C.3.53,p.107.21), and the Synod of Tyre (v.C.4.42,p.137.24), as well as in the form ἐξαίρετον in the letter to the Orientals (v.C. 2.29,p.60.22). In the Oration however, μάλιστα only occurs four times (155.30,160.6,188.5,192.9), while ἐξαιρέτως occurs five times (155.1, 157.1,162.1,163.12,175.2), and the adjective ἐξαίρετος comes four times. The fact that Constantine and the Orator use both adverbs shows that they shared a particular idiom, which was not however peculiar to them;[5] the different proportion of use of the two words may be due to circumstances or translation. This is an example of a use of vocabulary which is consistent with Constantinian authorship of the Oration, but does not prove it.

2.2.1.2: λογισμός In the Gelasian Oration to Nicaea, λογισμός is used at least five times, and it occurs elsewhere in the Constantinian documents. The Orator never uses this word, preferring λόγος (e.g. 157.17,163.1). This could indicate a different author, a different usage in one particular document, or the use of a different translator. It could be an indication against Constantinian authorship, but, as with other items of vocabulary, is too limited to build a case on.

2.2.1.3: παρουσία The Orator uses this word of God's presence (175.33) as well as Christ's coming (181.21). It does not occur in the v.C. documents, but is used of Christ's incarnation in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.13,p.48.18) and of God's presence in the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.27,p.73.1). This similar usage is interesting given the other words used in the Oration to refer to the advent of Christ, and the absence of these in Constantine's writings (see Dörries 1954/ 160f.).

2.2.1.4: πονηρός Constantine's references to Satan, though infrequent, are usually to ὁ διάβολος, while the Orator refers once to ὁ πονηρός (166.17). The letter to Arius however has two references to ὁ πονηρός (Op.3,34.12,16,pp.70.27,71.11), indicating that this is consistent with Constantinian phraseology.

2.2.1.5: βούλησις The letter to the Nicomedians refers to a hypostatised βούλησις as a description of the Son (Op.3,27.1-3,p.58.4-15), which the Orator does not. But as Constantine also uses the word to

apply to God's will (e.g.v.C.2.28,p.71.24f.), so it occurs in the Oration (162.28;compare 176.22V); the fact that it is hypostatised in one of Constantine's letters does not mean that this use was particularly important for him and should have been reflected in the Oration.

2.2.1.6: καρπός In the letter to the Orientals (v.C.2.25,p.58.27f.) Constantine states that those who act out of justice and goodness will receive τὸν καρπὸν γλυκύν. Similarly the Orator promises γλυκύν τινα καρπόν (185.6) as a reward for endurance. The phrasing and idea are similar, which, given the little use of the word made by Constantine,[6] is perhaps significant.

2.2.1.7: νεῦμα The Orator refers at one point (176.1) to the νεῦμα θεοῦ. νεῦμα is apparently more common in Eusebius than in Constantine; it occurs in the v.C. letters only twice, used of Constantine's approval (v.C.2.67,p.74.25), and in a minority of MSS to the divine νεῦμα rather than πνεῦμα (v.C.2.40,p.65.13LHF). However, νεῦμα is used of the divine will or command in the Nicene Oration, not only in the v.C. version (3.12,p.87.14) which may have been influenced by Eusebian vocabulary, but four times in the Gelasian version (Gel.h.e.2.7.2, 13,27,36,pp.46.14,48.20,50.21,52.25). The Orator's use of the phrase is consistent with Constantine's usage in his known oration.

2.2.1.8: σκαιότης The Orator uses this word of man's obstinate folly (170.31). Words derived from σκαιός do not occur at all in the v.C., but are used six times by Constantine elsewhere to describe folly (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.22,35,37,pp.49.26,52.18,25f.; to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.15,p.62.1; to the Catholic Alexandrians,Athan.apol. 62.3,p.142.3; to Athanasius,Athan.apol.68.2,p.146.10).

2.2.1.9: μεγαλοψυχία This word is surprisingly common in the Oration: it is used seven times of the patience of God or man in the face of wickedness and persecution (166.32,167.3,170.20,171.12,18,174.22, 177.24), and once of God's generosity in creation (162.12). Constantine only uses it once, referring to endurance (to the Orientals,v.C. 2.33,p.62.19); he uses the opposite μικροψυχία in congratulating John Archaph on his repentance (Athan.apol.70.2,p.148.15), but it still seems surprising that the word should be used relatively frequently in one work if this is ascribed to Constantine. However, in the letter to the Numidian bishops (Opt.app.X,p.214.36f.) Constantine mentions

the aequo animo...et patientia of God, showing that the idea is Constantinian. Also, the Orator was speaking on the occasion of the Passion when God's forebearance was in his mind, which could explain the frequency with which the word is used (compare Or.166.30-167.4,170.13-22,175.22ff.).

2.2.1.10: ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις The Orator twice introduces a possible question directed against his argument with these words (165.11,170.24), and elsewhere uses the same technique with different wording (168.7). Constantine uses the same phrase in the letter to the Catholic Alexandrians (Athan.apol.61.3,p.141.20). If it was a technique of Constantinian dialectic, it may not appear more frequently because Constantine's letters do not usually indulge in argument, but exhortation. The parallel phrasing does not prove identity of authorship -- two writers could be using a common device -- but is consistent with it.

There are thus more verbal similarites, as well as differences, between the Oration and the Constantinian documents than previous scholars have noted. Others doubtless await discovery. But the possible coincidental nature of verbal similarities, and the minimisation of verbal differences by ascribing them to differences in translation or context, make it difficult to draw certain conclusions. On balance, there is a fair degree of consistency of vocabulary between the Constantinian documents and the Oration; how do they compare when particular themes are considered which depend on verbal ideas rather than exact parallels of wording?

2.2.2: Themes

2.2.2.1: Law Dörries (1954/150) pointed out the importance of νόμος for Constantine, particularly in the way he uses it as a synonym for Christianity, and that this agrees with the standpoint of the Orator. He is right to note that examples of some ways in which νόμος is used in the Oration can be found in Constantine's writings. Thus the θεῖος νόμος which commands the stars (161.6) is equivalent to the law of nature referred to in the letter to the Provincials (v.C.2.48,58); the laws which guide the church (184.24ff.) and produce righteous fruit (184.30), and the ἁγνόν τινα νόμον of piety (187.20), are the principles of Christian worship and doctrine, referred to often by Constantine (e.g.Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.1; to the African Catholics, Opt.app.IX). There are however two differences between the Orator and

Constantine when this theme is considered. First, Constantine's use of 'law' as a synonym for religion is not reflected in the Oration: the θεῖος νόμος of the Virgil commentary (184.30) may have this sense, and it is reflected in the right moral as well as religious conduct referred to in the use of νόμος elsewhere (173.30f.,176.26); but it is hardly prominent in the Oration, while being very important in Constantine's works. This may however be due to different contexts: the Constantinian documents are generally concerned with order and conformity, but the Orator is engaging with paganism at a more intellectual level. Second, the Orator never uses νόμος of the Bible, while Constantine does (e.g.Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.35,p.52.9; to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.69.1,70,71.5,pp.75.20,76.19,77.20); but the Orator makes scant reference to scripture, providing no context for this usage. There may be some difference of translation: e.g. διδασκαλία (171.26) and κόσμιος (βίος) (170.28f.) are equivalent in sense to νόμος. Dörries is thus generally correct to draw a parallel between the Orator and Constantine in their use of the idea of law, but is perhaps too confident in saying that it is 'völlig gleicht' (p.150).

2.2.2.2: Purity Dörries (1954/158) observes that ἄχραντος is used both in the Oration (189.28) and the letter to the Provincials (v.C. 2.59,p.72.4). But the Orator says that God and the soul are καθαρὸς καὶ ἄχραντος, while Constantine describes Christian worship as 'undefiled' in comparison to paganism -- on its own, hardly a convincing parallel. But in the letter to Theodotus (Op.3,28.1,p.63.12), Constantine mentions καθαρὰν...τὴν διάνοιαν εἰλικρινῆ τε καθοσίωσιν καὶ ἄχραντον πίστιν, and he uses the adjectives καθαρός and εἰλικρινής in a number of other places to qualify religious words (e.g.Edict against the heretics,v.C. 3.64.2,p.118.4,12f.,24; Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e. 2.7.4,21,pp.46.25,49.18; to Athanasius,Athan.apol.68.5,p.146.28f.). This is completely consistent with the usage of the Orator, who can refer to καθαρὰ πίστις (165.26,171.10,192.14), πίστις εἰλικρινής (189.4,192.14), εἰλικρινοῦς καθοσιώσεως (171.10), and Plato's belief being held ἀκαθάρτως τε καὶ μὴ εἰλικρινῶς (164.5f.; compare 155.24,162.28, 168.29,171.8,22f.,173.32,187.17f.,189.9,12). Both Constantine and the Orator use the concept of purity in a religious sense, using the same range of vocabulary: a more convincing set of parallels as a whole than the one selected by Dörries.

2.2.2.3: Healing Dörries (1954/157) has also noted that the Orator refers to conversion as 'healing' (187.23), using ἰάομαι in the same way as Constantine does in the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.42,p.75.2). But this one reference does not convey the extent of the way in which both authors use the analogy of 'curing' and 'healing' when referring to salvation. The Orator uses θεραπεία of God's cure for sin (165.23, 26,187.22,189.3) as well as ἴαμα (165.28) and ἄκος (165.30), and describes Christ as an ἰατρός (169.31), giving men a φάρμακον (174.14) by his teaching.[7] Constantine points to the caelestis medicina needed to overcome schism (to the African Catholics,Opt.app.IX,p.213.9f.), and uses similar metaphorical vocabulary in his letters: θεραπεία (e.g.to the Orientals,v.C.2.28,p.60.3; to Alexander and Arius,v.C. 2.68,p.75.5; to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.12,p.60.17); ἴαμα (to the Provincials,v.C.2.59,p.72.2; Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.26,p.50.15) together with ἴασις (to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.68,p.75.6) and ἰατρική (to the Provincials,v.C.2.59,p.72.2); and ἰατρός (in the summaries of the speech after Nicaea and the letter to Antioch,v.C. 3.21,59,pp.93.26,112.7). Constantine can also refer to heresy as a νόσος (to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.66,p.74.16) or νόσημα (Edict against the heretics,v.C.3.64.4,p.118.14; compare 3.64.1,65.1,pp. 117.26f.,118.17). The use of a medical metaphor for heresy and salvation was not peculiarly Constantinian: e.g. Maximin refers to the request of the people of Tyre for an ἴασις to counter impiety (Eus. h.e.9.7.6,p.816.3). Nonetheless, its occurrence in the Oration as well as in the letters of Constantine is a possible indication that they came from the same author.

2.2.2.4: Light Pfättisch (1908/79) gives a number of parallels in Constantine's letters to the Orator's use of φῶς (154.18). Dörries (1954/153) repeated those which contained the same phrase as the Oration, φῶς ἀληθείας, and later (pp.343ff.) mentioned more places in Constantine's letters which referred to the symbol of light, pointing out that this was consistent with Constantine's use of the sun as an ambiguous religious symbol. The theme of light is frequent in Constantine's works, in Latin as well as Greek (e.g.luce legis catholicae,to the Synod of Arles,Opt.app.V,p.209.4;verae lucis,to the Numidian bishops,Opt.app.X,p.215.35). It is particularly prominent in the Oration to Nicaea, where λαμπρότης occurs six times (Gel.h.e. 2.7.3, 7,15,28,29,31,pp.46.17,47.15,48.28,51.1,9,17); a phrase similar to Or.154.17f., τῆς ἀληθείας...λαμπρότης, occurs in the letter to the

Alexandrians (Op.3,25.2,p.52.6f.). The Orator makes metaphorical use of the theme in more than one part of his work. Pfättisch (1908/79) points out that the Oration begins with the description of light as τηλαυγέστερον (154.2), a word which is also found in the letter to Athanasius (Athan.apol.68.3,p.146.23) in a different context. Twice the Orator mentions the shining of the Saviour's incarnation (ἐπιλάμπω, 155.4; ἐκλάμπω, 181.21); he also refers to Christ as the light (169. 19f.), to the light of truth (160.7f.), pure light in worship (171. 22f.), and to the shining of the stars becoming λαμπροτέρα in response to God's vengeance on earth (191.29). These references exhibit their own parallels with Constantinian usage: e.g. καθαρὸν...φῶς (171.22f.) is identical in wording, though not context, with a phrase in the letter to the Provincials (v.C.2.57,p.71.13). The use of another theme by both Constantine and the Orator helps to build up the case for their identification as the same person.

2.2.3: God

Heikel (1902/lxxxiii-vi) and Dörries (1954/352-60) looked at the ways in which Constantine referred to God, emphasising his use of hypostatisation, especially of πρόνοια, and his other circumlocutions for θεός. This section is concerned more narrowly with the question as to whether the names used for God in the Oration and the Constantinian writings are consistent: hypostatisation is left on one side for the present, as is θεός, since there is ample evidence for both being used by Constantine and the Orator.

2.2.3.1: θεῖον The Orator uses θεῖον three times in prepositional phrases (155.29,165.22,170.19,) and five times absolutely (173.24, 189.17,29(x2),191.9). Constantine uses divinitas (e.g.to Celsus,Opt. app.VII,p.212.7) and θεῖον some twenty times, the latter both in prepositional phrases (e.g.to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.65.1,p.74.5) and absolutely (e.g.to the Orientals,v.C.2.28.1,p.60.4f.). The Oration to Nicaea uses θεῖον three times (Gel.h.e. 2.7.6,28,41,pp.47.9,50.26, 53.27); the letter to the Orientals four times (v.C.2.28.1(x2),29.3, 30.1,pp.60.4,5,61.4,8); in other letters it is used only once. Because of the uncertain date of the Gelasian Oration, the Oration cannot be said to be pre-Nicene on the basis of this word; but its use in the Oration is consistent with its use by Constantine.

2.2.3.2: κρείττων The Orator uses this word as a title for God four times (161.33,165.18,174.1,187.26). Heikel (1902/lxxxv) said that Constantine only used it in his early letters. This is correct: it occurs frequently in the letter to the Orientals, five times in the letter to Alexander and Arius, and once in the Eusebian Oration to Nicaea, and nowhere else in Constantine's writings as a title for God. Given that the vocabulary of the Oration to Nicaea could have been influenced by Eusebius -- Heikel (1902/lxxxv n.2) notes the use of this title for God five times in the context of the v.C. -- the Constantinian use of κρείττων is pre-Nicene, and could indicate an early date for the Oration. The fact however that Eusebius uses it in the v.C., written after Constantine's death, suggests that it is unsafe to draw too firm a conclusion from this about when the Oration was written. But it is certainly possible for Constantine to have used κρείττων of God in an oration.

2.2.3.3: πατήρ God is called Father eleven times in the Oration (155.10f.,156.2,163.30(x2),166.19,169.9,15f.,174.9,21,184.23,185.23; compare 156.13), almost entirely in the context of the Father-Son relationship, with only two references to God as ὁ πατήρ τῶν πάντων (163.30,166.19). Constantine refers to God once as pater mundi (to the Numidian bishops,Opt.app.X,p.213.31), twice as πατήρ πάντων (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.8,p.47.21f.;to Sapor,v.C. 4.11.1,p.124.12f.), and once generally as πατήρ τῆς μονήρους δυνάμεως (to Arius, Op.3,34.26,p.72.24f.); apart from an uncertain reference in the letter to the Provincials (v.C.2.49,p.69.4JNAB), Constantine's other references to God as Father are also found in the context of disputes about the Father-Son relationship, in the letters to the Nicomedians and Arius (Op.3,27.1-3,8,pp.58.3f.,9,13,15,59.21;Op.3,34.4,14,30,pp.69.16, 71.2-5,73.12). His use of this name for God is thus entirely consistent with that of the Orator.

2.2.3.4: μέγιστος κτλ. A striking feature of Constantine's references to God is the use of adjectives with a superlative meaning: summus (e.g.to Celsus,Opt.app.VII,p.211.22,28), μέγιστος (e.g.to Eusebius, v.C.2.46,p.67.14), μέγας (to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.71.2,4,p.77.6, 14f.), and ὕψιστος (e.g.to the Provincials,v.C.2.48,51,pp.68.26,69.15). The fact that these were conventional epithets of divinity is shown by Maximin's description of Zeus as ὕψιστος καὶ μέγιστος (Eus.h.e.9.7.7, p.816.6). The Oration is surprisingly lacking in these adjectives:

there are two occurrences each of μέγιστος (169.9,185.23; compare 169.16) and μέγας (168.1,169.15f.), and only one of ὕψιστος (164.2). Constantine's use of these terms is however confined with one minor exception (to the Catholic Alexandrians,Athan. apol.61.1,p.141.7) to the letters written up to the period of the Nicene council, suggesting that the Oration is consistent with Constantine's later terminology.

2.2.3.5: omnipotens etc. Constantine has a high regard for the power of God (compare Dörries 1954/149f.), and calls God omnipotens several times (e.g.to the Synod of Arles,Opt.app.V,pp.208.28,210.16), translated by παντοκράτωρ (e.g.to the Alexandrians,Op.3,25.6,p.53.11) or more literally by terms such as παντοδυναμός (Oration to Nicaea,Gel. h.e.2.7.1,8,21,pp.46.7,47.19,49.18) or ὁ πάντα δυνατὸς θεός (to the Orientals,v.C.2.42,p.65.25). The Orator uses no such terms: his nearest equivalent is to speak of τὸν τῶν πάντων θεόν (154.13), a phrase similar to Constantine's ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεός (to Sapor,v.C.4.10.2, p.123.26). But the Oration does have an explicit as well as implicit awareness of the power of God (e.g.167.23-6,187.11); and, as has been noted in the previous paragraph, Constantine's references to God tend to become simpler and more direct in the letters after Nicaea. There is no close correspondence in the use of this term, but this need not be inconsistent with Constantinian authorship.

2.2.3.6: Other names Constantine uses several other names for God: σωτήρ is used of God as well as Christ (e.g.to Eusebius,v.C.4.36.1, p.134.1), a use not found in the Oration; δεσπότης often occurs (e.g. to Macarius,v.C.3.53.3,4,p.107.7f.,18f.), but is only quoted by the Orator from the Sibyl (187.2; but compare δεσποτεία, 156.20); and ἀρχηγός occurs in the letter to Sapor (v.C.4.11.1,p.124.13) and in the Oration (189.22), with a possible parallel in auctor (to the Numidian bishops,Opt.app.X,p.213.31). ἔφορος (on Easter,v.C.3.17.2,p.90.7;to the Tyre bishops,Athan.apol.86.7,p.165.9; compare παντέφορος in the letter to the Alexandrians,Op.3,25.9,p.54.7) is not found in the Oration, but its sense may be represented by ἐπόπτης (160.12,171.20), which Dörries (1954/156) suggested was similar in meaning to a passage in the letter to the Synod of Arles (Opt.app.V,p.208.26f.). The Orator also uses a few other names: δικαστής (172.33) and προστάτης (156.20) have no parallel in Constantine; but the description of God as δημιουργός (156.28,163.22) is also found in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.10,p.48.7).

A comparison of the names used for God by Constantine and the Orator thus shows a reasonable degree of consistency between the two authors. The Orator's use of θεῖον and κρείττων could suggest a pre-Nicene date for the Oration; but the fact that discrepancies in the use of adjectives can be explained more easily by postulating a post-Nicene date of delivery shows that firm conclusions cannot be drawn from the ambiguous evidence. Particular differences in terminology can be accounted for by varying translations, and the different context of the Oration when compared to the various Constantinian letters.

The consideration of verbal parallels between Constantine's letters and the Oration is inevitably selective and inconclusive. But within the limitations of this survey it is possible to draw one definite conclusion: that Constantine could have been the author of the Oration, and the differences between the wording of his letters and the Oration can be accounted for. The similarities evident in particular themes provide more positive evidence for the identity of authorship, but are insufficient to prove it. Does a consideration of conceptual parallels between Constantine and the Orator affect this conclusion?

3. DOCTRINE OF GOD

It can be difficult to separate the doctrines of God and Christ in both the Oration and the letters of Constantine. However, this section will concentrate on the theology of the Trinity, including the relationship of Father and Son, whilst the next section will be concerned with doctrine about Christ. How similar are the views of Constantine and the Orator regarding Father, Son, and Holy Spirit?

3.1: Father

Both Constantine and the Orator are monotheists: they believe in a supreme God who rules over all (see Heikel 1902/xcix;Pfättisch 1908/108;Dörries 1954/136,148). Thus the Orator upholds the sole lordship of God (156.20f.,189.8), who rules everything (159.17f.) with reason and providence (162.7f.); Constantine acknowledges one God (to Arius, Op.3,34.13) who is the source of all (to Sapor,v.C.4.11.1) and possesses almighty power (to the Orientals,v.C.2.28.1). There is no surprise in their sharing such a view, which was common among Christians and pagan monotheists. Nor is it surprising that they both regard God as

not circumscribed, περιγράφειν, but himself as surrounding all (Or. 187.11; to Arius,Op.3,34.27,pp.72.30-73.3); the coincidence of vocabulary is not very significant, since the context is slightly different, and the idea is hardly peculiar to either author. Chapter three of the Oration contains a sustained argument for monotheism as against polytheism, for which there is no occasion in Constantine's letters; but underlying them is a firm conviction of the rightness of monotheism, especially in the letters to the Orientals and Provincials, which argue on the more practical theme that polytheism has brought disaster, and trust in one God has brought success.

3.2: Son

3.2.1: Terminology There are various descriptions of the Son in the Oration and Constantine's letters. ὁ λόγος is only found in a philosophical discussion of Plato's doctrines in the Oration (163.25-31) and in Constantine's exposition of Arius' doctrines (to Arius,Op.3,34.13f.,pp.70.31,71.2), and possibly in his letter to Alexander (Op.3, 32.3,p.66.9). It is not a normal title for either author, but both acknowledge it. 'Son' is the normal title in the Oration (see above IV.6): παῖς occurs nine times, five times as a title for Christ (167.21,168.2,4,174.8,179.7) and four times in a Trinitarian context (156.3,163.28,29,168.8); υἱός comes only twice in one clause (168.17f.). Constantine refers to Christ as υἱός in the letter to the Provincials (v.C.2.57,p.71.12), a reference which Kraft (1955/91) put in the margin with no MSS support, and to the relationship of πατήρ and υἱός in the letters to the Nicomedians and Arius, using υἱός six times (Op.3,27.1-3,8,pp.58.3f.,7,13,59.21;Op.3,34.14,p.71.5). He also refers to 'Christ the Son' as παῖς in the same letters (definitely in Op.3,34.26,p.72.27; possibly in Op.3,27.4,p.58.16, in the Gelasian version, not accepted by Opitz in the text), showing that he could use the same titles in the same ways as the Orator. Other titles for the Son in the Oration are: σωτήρ (156.15, implied in the argument 168.16ff.; compare 169.15); ὁ δεύτερος θεός (163.20f.); Χριστός (168.16, compare 169.15); δημιουργός (168.21); and πρόνοια (169.16,170.1; compare 178.17). Constantine does not refer to the Platonic idea of the second God, but in the letter to the Nicomedians he does call the Son σωτήρ and Χριστός (Op.3,27.1,p.58.2) as well as δημιουργός (Op.3, 27.2,p.58.7; also to the Catholic Alexandrians,Athan.apol.61.1,p.141.7). Grillmeier (1975/261ff.) following Kraft (1954-5/17f.) maintained that the letter's opening sentence τὸν δεσπότην θεὸν δηλαδὴ καὶ

σωτῆρα Χριστὸν ἀκριβῶς...ἴστε...πατέρα τε καὶ υἱὸν εἶναι (Op.3,27.1, p.58.2f.) showed that Constantine used Χριστός of both Father and Son. Dörries (1954/70n.1) correctly held this to be an error, since it rests not only on a strained interpretation of the Greek, but also ignores Constantine's subsequent identification of Christ with the Son (Op.3,27.2). Constantine does not refer directly to the Son as πρόνοια, but does acclaim Christ's providence (to the Synod of Arles,Opt. app.V,p.209.5). He uses two other hypostatisations of the Son, βούλησις (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.1-3,p.58.4,11,14f.) and αἰών (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.5,p.47.3; compare to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.1, p.58.3), which Kraft (1954-5/19ff.;1955/109ff.) ascribed to Gnostic influence. But the Orator uses βούλησις, though not hypostatised, while most of the Gnostic writings referred to by Kraft use θέλημα: apart from the use of αἰών, Kraft's case for Gnostic influence is not strong, and Constantine may have found this exceptional usage in other sources and adapted it for his own purposes: also, his use of these terms is obscure, and may rest on a Latin version which does not hypostatise (compare to the Numidian bishops,Opt.app.X,p.214f.). The other title given by Constantine to the Son, τῆς ἀθανασίας χορηγός (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.2,p.58.8), is paralleled by the Orator's final words describing Christ as ἀθανασίας ἡγεμών, ἀιδίου ζωῆς χορηγός (192.31f.). The ways in which Constantine and the Orator describe the second person of the Trinity are very similar, enhancing the case for common authorship.

3.2.2: Father-Son relationship Pfättisch (1908/94,97-102) argued that Constantine in the Oration and his letters regarded the Logos as the world-soul of Platonic theory. Kurfess (1919-20/76) agreed that the Oration saw the Logos as begotten in the context of the world order, but held that this must be pre-Nicene, since Constantine's letter to Arius, which Pfättisch had analysed at some length to support his case, in fact argued for the orthodox view that the Logos was eternally begotten. Dörries (1954/148f.) reconciled the difference by seeing the teaching of the letters on the unity of Father and Son implicit in the Orator's stress on God's authority ruling the world through the Logos, Christ, who proceeds from his substance. The simplest way of comparing the doctrines of Constantine and the Orator on the relationship between Father and Son is to look at how they saw the principles of unity and begetting, and then to consider the status of the Son with regard to creation.

3.2.2.1: Divine unity Kraft (1955/272) correctly remarks on the fact that the only use of the word ὁμοούσιος in the Oration (172.13) is not theological; but he also acknowledges (1954-5/13,17f.) that it does not occur in Constantine's letters, holding that its use at Nicaea was as a negative limitation rather than a positive unifying formula. Its importance for Constantine cannot have been theological, which is consistent with Constantine not referring to it (compare Kelly 1972/254-62). Dörries (1954/370f.,382) held that the substance of the ὁμοούσιον was found in the letter to the Nicomedians (Op.3,27.1-3), where Arian ideas of assumption or division were anathematised, and in the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.14,p.71.5), where the fullness of the power of Father and Son is οὐσίαν μίαν. Constantine's statements about the Godhead make it clear that he saw the Son as God, not divided from the Godhead, co-existing with the Father (compare letter to Arius,Op.3, 34.30). The Orator also holds that the Son is God, while emphasising his subordination to the Father (163.18-28,168.17f.; compare the catchphrase θεὸς καὶ θεοῦ παῖς,e.g.167.21). It is not surprising that Constantine does not have any explicit subordinationism when writing against the Arians: it is nonetheless implicit in his view of the begetting of the Son as God's servant in creation (e.g.to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.2f.). The Orator's unifying principle of perfection (163.20f.) echoes Constantine's comment about one power of Father and Son (to Arius,Op.3,34.14). Further, the non-theological language of chapter three of the Oration (156.11-16) is consistent with Constantine in denying any separation of the Father's substance during the Son's generation.

Dörries (1954/159f.) however points to a difficulty which requires resolution before the consistency of the Orator's and Constantine's doctrines of divine unity can be accepted; namely that the Orator states that there are two οὐσίαι in the Godhead (163.20), while Constantine sees only one (to Arius,Op.3,34.13f.; compare to the Nicomedians, Op.3,27.8). He accounts for this apparent contradiction by ascribing it to differing phraseology or secretarial influence. The use of σπλάγχνοι for οὐσία (156.13) could well be due to a quirk of translation; there is however an alternative explanation. Kelly (1972/243f.) has pointed out that οὐσία could be used of individuals as well as a class, and that Basil referred to the Trinity as three οὐσίαι: Prestige (1952/142,192ff.) likewise referred to Eusebius as holding on to both one οὐσία of Godhead and two οὐσίαι of Father and Son. The Oration contains the word οὐσία in nine different places:

four (154.11,159.12,160.4,166.1) refer to individual essence,[8] two (160.25,168.26) to generic substance, and two (156.9,163.19) to being: the reference regarding God (163.20f.) could thus be to persons within the Godhead. Constantine can also use οὐσία in different ways: in the letter to the Nicomedians, the undivided οὐσία (Op.3,27.3,8,pp.58.15, 59.21) is the divine substance; but the obscure phrase τινος ἐξεζητημένης οὐσίας (Op.3,27.1,p.58.5f.) appears to have the meaning of individual being. The letter to Arius likewise contains the generic sense (Op.3,34.14,p.71.5) and examples of ambiguous and individual references (Op.3,34.13,29,pp.70.31,73.8). The apparent contradiction between the Orator and Constantine can thus be accounted for by the different sense given to οὐσία in particular contexts; Constantine is defending the unity of the Godhead against Arius, and the Orator is harmonising Christian theology with the Platonic doctrine of two gods.

3.2.2.2: Begetting As well as giving a philosophical justification for the begetting of the Son before creation (168.7-19), the Orator affirms the doctrine that the Son 'proceeds from' the Father, ἔχων τὴν ἀναφορὰν (εἰς) (156.11), τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἐχούσης (163.21f.). He emphasises in non-theological vocabulary that this separation and union in the Godhead is not τοπικῶς but νοερῶς (156.12f.), and that there is no actual division in the substance of Godhead. Dörries (1954/155,160) notes that Constantine explicitly denies division, διάστασις, in the Godhead (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.3,8,pp.58.15,59.23), and that he only uses ἀναφορά of the relationship of bishops' councils to the divine will (on Easter,v.C.3.20.1,p.92.21). However, the letter to the Tyre bishops (Athan.apol.86.11,p.165.30) has the same phrase as the Oration, ἔχοντα τὴν ἀναφοράν (πρός), albeit in a different context. The imprecision of the Oration compared with the more normal theological language of Constantine's letters does not mean that the Oration pre-dates Nicaea, since the translators and contexts were different. The substance of the doctrine of Constantine and the Orator is similar: although Constantine can proclaim the eternal begetting of the Son (to Arius,Op.3,34.13f.), while the Orator puts the Son's origin as being merely before creation (compare Dörries 1954/148f.), Constantine is writing directly against Arius' doctrines, and his statements elsewhere can be less clear (compare to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.1f.). The Orator is content to affirm the pre-existence of the Son without having the need to specify his theology more closely. Moreover, Constantine denies that there is any division as such in the Godhead

(compare to Arius,Op.3,34.14), rather than emphasising one particular word; ἀμερίστῳ προελεύσει (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.2,p.58.10) represents the meaning of chapter three of the Oration, and the fact that God's power has overcome separation in creating the world (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.8) is akin to the movement of separation and union in the Oration. Eusebius' letter to Caesarea after Nicaea (Op.3,22.7, p.44.4) reports that Constantine did not believe the Son to be ὁμοούσιος κατὰ τῶν σωμάτων πάθη, a qualification which is consistent with the τοπικῶς/νοερῶς contrast of the Orator. Given the different contexts of Constantine's letters and the Oration, there is a fair degree of consistency in their doctrine of the begetting of the Son.

3.2.3: Son-creation relationship Heikel (1911/14) pointed to the inconsistency within the Oration that the Father is said in chapter nine to be the demiurge (163.22), but in chapter eleven (168.21, compare 169.19) it is the Son, an inconsistency also noted by Pfättisch (1908/102), but which Dörries (1954/156) sidestepped. It is easier to understand this when the relationship in the Oration of the Son to creation is considered. The procession of the Son is closely linked with his rule over the world (156.15-22,163.21-5,168.14-22); the Son is the subordinate creator who rules the world, but through whom the world is made aware of the sole lordship of the Father. The Father rules through the Son; and thus in much of chapters three and five there is ambiguity as to whether the Orator is speaking of Father or Son when he addresses God. The picture of Christ in the Oration is of God's Son whose rule over the universe is made manifest in his earthly life (e.g.169.14-30); both Father and Son can thus be called demiurge, depending on whether the emphasis is on the Father's priority before the Son, or the Son's priority before the world. Constantine's letters similarly refer to the Father as demiurge (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e. 2.7.10) as well as the Son (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.2;to the Catholic Alexandrians,Athan.apol.61.1), and associate the begetting of the Son with the ordering of the world, achieved through him (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.2-3,8).[9] As the Son is the Father's agent in creation for the Orator, so for Constantine God in begetting Christ was making a helper for himself (to Arius,Op.3,34.29). Pfättisch (1908/97-102) is thus correct to note the similarity between Constantine and the Orator in their view of the Son's relationship to creation, although he overstretches the mark in trying to show that this was in fact a Platonic concept of the world-soul: his exegesis of the letter to

Arius (Op.3,34.32) argues that Constantine holds the world to be a living being with Christ as the soul, whereas the letter is concerned merely to draw the analogy between the spirit of Christ, untouched in a suffering body, and God's spirit present in the world yet not partaking in evil. Dörries (1954/160) cannot explain the contrast between the world having a form, its spirit appearing as a form, and the statement in the Oration that a divine being has no form (158.6ff.). But Constantine is not speaking of God, but of the way the world appears to be; there is no contradiction here. Constantine and the Orator share a similar traditional rather than Platonic view of the Son.

3.3: Spirit

Heikel (1911/34) held that the Orator, in referring to the Holy Spirit, was simply speaking of God. Pfättisch (1908/87-91) analysed the references more carefully, and looked also at Constantine's references to the Spirit, and concluded that in both authors there was a very loose use of 'Spirit' which showed little awareness of Trinitarian theology. Dölger (1910/55) agreed, with the qualification that Pfättisch was wrong to excise the passage about Noah's dove (168.26ff.) which however referred to the Logos and not the Holy Spirit. Dörries (1954/374) agreed with this assessment of Constantine's view of the Spirit not being theological, but did not relate it to the theology of the Orator. He did however note (1954/159f.) that the Orator used ἐπίπνοια of divine inspiration (154.16,156.2,7,165.7,179.15,192.7), while Constantine did not use the word but had the same idea in προτροπῇ τοῦ θείου (to Eusebius,v.C.3.61.3,p.115.23f.) and ὑπομνήσει θεοῦ (to the Alexandrians,Op.3,25.3,p.52.8), showing a difference of translator not doctrine. This fits with the way in which both Constantine and the Orator ascribe their deeds to God (Or.156.2-7,165.31f., 166.19-22,187.28f.,192.7ff.;to the Orientals,v.C.2.28, to the Synod of Arles,Opt.app.V,p.208.28-31, to the Provincials,v.C.2.55).

The use made by the Orator and Constantine of πνεῦμα is equally vague: for both it refers to the stuff of divinity, and its actual application depends on its context, which is often difficult to understand. In both authors however there are four possible ways in which πνεῦμα may be used.

3.3.1: Holy Spirit

There are two places in the Oration which may contain a reference to the Spirit as a part of the Trinity. The first

depends on seeing ἐπίπνοια as a hypostatisation referring to the Spirit of Father and Son (156.2f.), a view which Pfättisch (1913a/101) was unsure about; it is going too far to claim an explicit reference to the Holy Spirit here, but the Orator's words do suggest that he saw the Father and Son acting together in a spiritual way, which is at least a precursor to a doctrine of the Trinity. The second reference (183.21f.) appears to identify τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ σπάργανα with πνεύματος ἁγίου δύναμις: a natural interpretation of this would be that the heavenly child, Christ, was clothed with the power of the Spirit, suggesting a differentiation between Christ and the Spirit. It is however too obscure to be certain; and the reference to the Spirit a few lines lower down (184.7) seems to apply to Christ rather than the Holy Spirit. If the Orator does have a clear doctrine of the Trinity, he obscures it very well!

Constantine is likewise unclear. The letters on Easter (v.C. 3.18.5) and to the Catholic Alexandrians (Op.3,25.8) describe the Spirit as being and illuminating the divine will. The connection with βούλησις (compare to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.2f.) is interesting; it suggests perhaps that τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα describes God in action in a hypostatised way, similar to Trinitarian doctrine, but does not show awareness of the Holy Spirit as an equal member of the Godhead. This is borne out by a statement in the letter to Alexander (Op.3,32.1) which refers to the decisions made by the Holy Spirit through the bishops; God's action in men's minds is the context of Constantine's reference to the Spirit. These references to the Spirit can be stretched either way to apply to the Trinity, or merely to God (compare Heikel 1911/34), but their natural sense is to lie uneasily between these two poles: a lack of clarity shared by the Orator.

3.3.2: Christ Pfättisch (1908/88) argued that the references to the Spirit in the context of the birth of the Saviour (Or.182.7f.,183.21f.) apply the Spirit of Luke 1.35 to Christ. The latter reference is discussed in the paragraph above: in the former, the exact meaning of τοῦ θείου πνεύματος depends on whether the genitive is objective or subjective. It is however preferable to see this as another imprecise use of πνεῦμα by the Orator: he is saying that the divine power is in and behind the advent of Christ, and is not making a definitive Christological statement. His comment that the body of Christ was separated from the Holy Spirit by his death (184.6f.) seems however to be a reference to the spirit of Christ, although it could also apply to the

separation of the Son from the Father. But it is intended to describe the incarnation and death of Christ, and is not a theological statement that the Spirit is the same as the Son. Constantine accepts an Arian statement (to Arius,Op.3,34.14,p.71.1) that τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀϊδιότητος was born in the Logos, referring to the Incarnation: πνεῦμα here clearly does not mean the Third Person of the Trinity, but is not explicitly Christological either; it refers to the stuff of divinity rather than the Son in a full sense. Constantine refers to the will of Christ as divine spirit in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.21), which again associates Christ and will with the stuff of divinity, but does not clearly show that Constantine held that Christ and the Spirit were identical.

3.3.3: God The two remaining explicit references to the Spirit found in Constantine (to the Orientals,v.C.2.40;Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e. 2.7.41) are both references to God in general, speaking of God's guidance and teaching. The Orator also uses πνεῦμα in this general sense to refer to God: the Spirit's guidance of Israel (177.11) is held by Pfättisch (1913a/115) to refer to Christ, but this is an a priori assumption -- a general reference to God fits the context better, and also coheres with Constantinian usage; and the Orator says that the Holy Spirit is ἄπειρον with regard to marriage (187.12f.), not 'God', because he is emphasising God's holy and non-material quality. Dörries (1954/381) notes that Constantine (to Arius,Op.3, 34.27,34) applies this word to God and Christ, which is a further link between the two authors.

3.3.4: Spirit Constantine associates the πνεῦμα of God with divine and human life in the spiritual realm: the Spirit illuminates God's will by abiding in and legislating through the minds of bishops, is the will of Christ, and guides and teaches the church. Constantine also refers to God breathing his Spirit into us (Oration to Nicaea, Gel.h.e.2.7.33), which Pfättisch (1908/80) notes as a parallel to the Orator's use of ἐμπνεῦσαι (164.8). There is a common source for this in Genesis 2.7. But it is significant that this application of πνεῦμα by Constantine is consistent with the statements of the Orator in that whole section of chapter nine (164.6-15), where he identifies τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ with λογικὴν ψυχήν in the course of following the Platonic division of the universe into spiritual and material, the spiritual partaking of divine spirit and thus enduring for ever. τὸ

πνεῦμα relates the spiritual substance of God to the constitution of the spiritual and material worlds. The Orator is expounding philosophically the doctrine of πνεῦμα implicitly held by Constantine; they share the same uses of πνεῦμα, which is applied in varying contexts with different shades of meaning, but which basically refers to the divine substance in its interaction with the world.

A comparison of the doctrine of God in Constantine's letters and the Oration shows that, while they differ in superficial ways, fundamentally they are the same. The theologically naive way in which the Son and Spirit are referred to in both authors suggests that the Orator and Constantine could be the same person; and it also suggests that the Oration has not been worked on by a theologically trained reviser.

4. CHRISTOLOGY

4.1: 'Christ'

The Orator uses the name Christ thirteen times (e.g.155.13,167.21) and Jesus once (179.18). He also refers nineteen times to ὁ σωτήρ (e.g.155.5,167.14,181.21); and he openly acknowledges that one of the main intentions of his work is the glorification of Christ (158.13ff.). Kraft however (1955/91,108,272) maintained that Constantine only mentioned the name of Christ in his letter to the Nicomedians, and hardly referred to him at all in other ways elsewhere -- which, if true, would be a major obstacle to Constantinian authorship of the Oration. But Kraft takes undue liberties regarding the genuineness of the Constantinian documents (see above 1.3). It is true that Constantine never names Jesus (so Hartmann 1902/13), but the single instance of its use in the Oration is in the context of introducing the ΙΧΘΥΣ acrostic. Constantine does use the name of Christ in several letters: six times in the letter to the Synod of Arles (Opt.app.V,pp.208.31, 209.5,14,23,26,34), where he also uses the titles salvator and dominus; three times in the letter to the Nicomedians (Op.3,27.1,2,4,p.58.2,7, 16), as well as σωτήρ (27.1,p.58.2), υἱός (27.1-3,8,pp.58.3f.,7,13, 59.21), and δεσπότης (27.4,p.58.16); once in a letter to Eusebius (v.C.4.35,p.133.10) and in the letter to the Synod of Tyre (v.C.4.42.1, p.137.2); and ten times in the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.3,6f.,26,29, 32-4,pp.69.11,70.1,3,72.27,73.8,18,25,31), with the other titles κύριος

(34.3,p.69.11), λόγος (34.13f.,pp.70.31,71.2), υἱός (34.14, p.71.5), παῖς (34.26,p.72.27), and ἀρχηγέτης (34.26,p.72.28). He refers to Christ in other ways elsewhere: as υἱός in the letter to the Provincials (v.C.2.57,p.71.12); in the Oration to Nicaea he speaks about the ministry of Christ, the σωτήρ and διδάσκαλος (Gel.h.e.2.7.13f.,p.48.17, 23); the letter on Easter calls the Jews κυριοκτόνοι (v.C.3.18.4,19.1, pp.90.27,91.24) and refers twice to ὁ σωτήρ (v.C.3.18.3,5,pp.90.22, 91.13); the letter to the Alexandrians also mentions ὁ σωτήρ (Op.3, 25.4,p.53.4), as does the letter to Macarius (v.C.3.30.1, p.97.12); and the letter to the Palestinian bishops refers to the Saviour's appearance at Mamre (v.C.3.53.3f.,p.107.9,19) while not making it clear whether this applies to Christ or God.

There are thus five Constantinian letters which use the name Christ, and a further five or six which refer to Christ in other ways. The scarcity of references can be accounted for to some degree by Constantine's eirenic stress on monotheism: Christ is thus not mentioned in the letters to the Orientals and Provincials because these are intended to direct pagans and Christians to worship one God. The letter to Alexander and Arius does not mention Christ because it is also concerned with right worship towards the deity, not with Christological controversy. Other letters may not contain references to Christ because they were drafted in chancellery: it is interesting to note that the three letters which mention Christ more than once are those which exhibit a mixture of theologising and invective directed towards the resolution of a problem of ecclesiastical politics; as important letters these may have been written by Constantine with no editing in chancellery. Furthermore, just as Constantine is capable of referring to Christ frequently in particular parts of his letters, so in the Oration there are only six places which refer to Christ, Son, or Saviour outside the major theological sections in chapters eleven and fifteen to twenty-one (155.4-13,156.3,156.14ff.,158.14, 163.19-31,192.25-32). It is wrong to suggest that Constantine ignored Christ and that the Orator was Christ-centred: both could ignore or expound the doctrine of Christ according to context. There is no evidence for inconsistency between the two authors here.

4.2: The divinity of Christ

The Orator has a naive and strong view of Christ as God. He regards him as the demiurge come down to renew creation (168.19-22, 169.18-21), even on the cross (170.20-3); he is addressed as God

(167.21,169.15,179.5ff.,182.9,18); and 'God' is used interchangeably with 'Christ' when speaking of his earthly life (166.31,168.25,170.12, 19,176.12,186.24-7; compare 167.4,169.15,170.1f.,19,178.17,185.22f.). There is no sense of the problems of Christology in the Orator's approach, which, while acknowledging the relationship of Father and Son, is in places naively pietistic. Dörries (1954/138) rightly describes his Christology as undogmatic. Constantine can be equally undogmatic: in the letter to the Synod of Arles (Opt.app.V,p.209f.) he not only mentions the providence of Christ, but also refers to those who attack Christ as attacking God himself. The Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.13f.,16,20) refers indiscriminately to the divinity of the Saviour and his providence; the letter to the Nicomedians (Op.3, 27.1-4,8) however is much more careful, distinguishing chiefly between Father and Son, while possibly referring to Christ directly as God at one point (27.5); and the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.13f.,33) cautiously refrains from saying more than that God is present in Christ. This would suggest that the later Constantine was more theologically sophisticated, and that the Oration, if by him, must be of a date around or earlier than the time of Nicaea. It is however necessary to note the differing contexts of the Oration and Constantine's theological letters: the Oration was directed on a popular level to Christians as a justification against paganism, while the letters are addressing church leaders on a point of doctrine which is politically important. The Orator and Constantine both believed in the divinity of Christ, and could both express it undogmatically; Constantine could have been responsible for the Christology of the Oration, even after Nicaea, given its different context.

4.3: Incarnation

Dörries (1954/160f.) noted that the Orator refers several times to Christ's κάθοδος/κατέλευσις while Constantine's letters do not, and accounts for this by suggesting that Constantine had no context in which to expound the Incarnation. Pfättisch (1908/102f.) remarked on the stress found in the Oration on the virgin birth, and its absence in Constantine except for a possible reference in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.13), which he explained by pointing to the ineffectiveness of using the doctrine of the virgin birth against Arianism. He further speculated (pp.104ff.) that the Christology of the Orator and Constantine was Apollinarian, with the Logos taking the place of the νοῦς in man. The evidence in the Oration is however too slight to

show clearly how the Orator conceived of the relationship between Godhead and manhood in Christ. He saw the Incarnation as God coming into a human, fleshly body, born of a virgin (168.19-28,176.20,184.6ff.,186.24ff.,187.12f.); his discussion of Plato's division of the world into spiritual and material essences (164.6-15) could perhaps allow of an Apollinarian interpretation, but is concerned with the relationship of the divine and spiritual to what is material, not with Christology. The Orator wants to show that Christ is God, not to explain how he could be human too. In the three documents where he refers to the Incarnation, Constantine exhibits a similar concern with the practical application of doctrine. The Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e. 2.7.13,21) talks of the Saviour receiving a body from a virgin, in which he dwelt, which became the means of salvation for human bodies, the emphasis here being on Christ's effective salvation for all. The letter to the Nicomedians (Op.3,27.4f.) seems to distinguish between God and his body on the analogy of the human soul and body, but with the aim of showing that Christ did not suffer when his body died, not in the context of Christological speculation. Likewise the letter to Arius (Op.3,34.14,32) accepts the idea that the incarnation was part of the divine economy, so that the incarnate Word could be trusted to make the Father truly known, and also argues that Christ had the form of a body as the world itself is a form, and so did not suffer. Like the Orator, Constantine was concerned to show that Christ was God, although his nominated opponents were Arians rather than pagans. Their doctrine of the Incarnation is thus consistent.

4.4: Ministry

Lietzmann (1953/159f.) compared the Orator's view that Christ came to teach the saving doctrine of a moral life (167.4-11,169.5-10,16f., 170.26-31,171.6-9,174.8-26) with Constantine's ideas in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.4,13,21,25). Constantine is however not as concerned with moral living in the Oration to Nicaea as Lietzmann suggested; but he was right to draw attention to the parallel between the exposition of the ministry of Christ in that Oration (Gel.h.e.2.7.13-20) and the Orator's similar stress. Constantine begins with Christ's teachings and goes on to mention the feeding of the five thousand, the resurrection of Lazarus, the healings of the woman with a haemorrhage and the paralytic, and the walking on the water. The letter to the Nicomedians (Op.3,27.5) also associates the giving of new doctrine with the exercise of miraculous power. The Orator simi-

larly stresses the healing power of Christ and the miracles of feeding the five thousand, stilling the storm, and walking on the water (169.2-5,10-14,170.7-12,175.9ff.) as well as Christ's teaching, and explains that they are two sides of the same divine mission (170.3-7): the miracles prove Christ's power to those of a lower nature who could not recognise him spiritually. It is interesting that it is in an oration that Constantine expounds the ministry of Christ; it is consistent with him being identified as the Orator.

4.5: Suffering

Constantine was concerned to show, against Arius, that Christ could be God, and therefore did not actually suffer (see Grillmeier 1975/261ff.;Kraft 1955/110f.). He refers explicitly to the Passion (on Easter,v.C.3.18.2;to Macarius,v.C.3.30.1), and explains it by drawing a distinction between the soul and body of man (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.4), and the analogy of God being present in all the world yet untouched by sin (to Arius,Op.3,34.32). The Orator refers four times to the Passion (154.5,170.14,176.14,19), using πάθημα instead of Constantine's πάθος, due to different translation.[10] He only alludes once to Christ's suffering on the cross (176.11-15, compare 170.20), and is there consistent with Constantine, saying that Christ received μηδεμία...βλάβη (176.14) from his apparent suffering.

4.6: Resurrection

Constantine does not mention the resurrection. But the letter on Easter (v.C.3.18) shows that Constantine knew the festival as one of deliverance and life over death, and he claimed to have read Eusebius' treatise on Easter (v.C.4.35); his references to the Passion of Christ (v.C.3.18.2,30.1) probably include the resurrection under the general heading of the Passion, especially given that his letter on the holy sepulchre refers to a monument of the Passion, not the resurrection as in Eusebius (v.C.3.28; compare Dörries 1954/394). The Oration contains two references to resurrection: the first (154.2f.) is also in the context of the Passion, suggesting that the Orator saw them as one event (compare 176.13ff.); the second (184.5-11) begins with the Passion and moves on to the evaluation of the resurrection as the prelude to the establishment of the church. As with Constantine, there is little theology in the Oration which deals with the status of Christ after the resurrection; and the reference to the resurrection of Christ, as with the obscure throwaway line (182.8ff.) about the

return of God to the world, is in the context of the commentary on Virgil, where the Orator was casting around for ways of expounding the poem. The context is unique, and it is not surprising that Constantine has nothing similar. Overall, the Christologies of the Orator and Constantine are consistent given the different contexts in which they were writing.

5. THE WORLD

5.1: God as Creator

The Orator has a strong sense of God as the creator of the world. Not only are there two accounts of God creating the world (158.16-159.6,172.14-23), but also in chapter three God is acclaimed as sole Lord of creation, and chapters six to eight wax lyrical on the testimony of creation to the providence of God. God is the source of the law of nature (161.6), and of nature itself (154.9ff., compare 186.23f.). Constantine has much less cause in his letters to refer to creation: but he calls God huius mundi auctor et pater (to the Numidian bishops, Opt.app.X,p.213.31) and demiurge (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.10). The world testifies to God as sole Lord and lawgiver of the earth, who created the world by his Word (to the Provincials,v.C.2.58), the latter sentiment possibly being included also in the Oration (163.26V). Constantine elsewhere (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.33f.) uses another teleological argument from the form of the human body to its creator. Both authors are aware of the world as the sphere of God's activity.

5.2: πρόνοια

This common awareness is particularly clear in the use made by both authors of the concept of πρόνοια. As Dörries (1954/149) has indicated, the ways in which the Orator uses πρόνοια, which occurs more than twenty times in the Oration, are paralleled by Constantine's use of the term: providence can be hypostatised or referred to Christ (e.g.Or.170.1,178.17;to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.71.4;to the Tyre bishops,Athan.apol.86.3); describes God in relation to nature (e.g.Or.156.15,161.29;to the Provincials,v.C.2.48) and the world of men (e.g.Or.157.7,192.5;to Eusebius,v.C.2.46.2); and indicates the work of God in salvation (e.g.Or.169.29,185.22;Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.14;to Eusebius,v.C.4.36.1). Dörries notes the use of πρόνοια of pagan gods by Maximin (Eus.h.e.9.7.3,p.814.8), while omitting its use by him to

describe his own care for his subjects (Eus.h.e.9.10.8,11,pp.842.23, 844.20) -- a usage which does not occur in Constantine or the Orator. The common use of πρόνοια by both authors is an argument for them being identical.

5.3: φύσις

Kraft (1954-5/16;1955/272) gave as one reason against Constantinian authorship of the Oration his view that Constantine associated φύσις with Christ, unlike the Orator who saw it as a contrary principle to Christ and his παθήμα. He based his assertion on the beginning of the Oration (154.2-13), where nature is contrasted with the day of the Passion as being of itself impotent. However, nature is also said there to be the creation of God, and the worship of God is in accordance with the principles of nature. The discussion of nature in chapter six is an attack on the pagan deification of nature: by itself, nature is a source of evil (159.21), but subject to God's laws is virtuous (159.22,160.10f.) and supplies human needs (160.20). Nature is later said to be the servant of the divine command (186.23f.). It is thus unfair to say that the Orator opposes φύσις to Christ. Constantine sees nature in a similar way to the Orator in his view that in Christ God gave the world law and direction (to Arius,Op.3,34.34), as well as using the phrase κατὰ φύσιν in a similar way to the Orator to describe love as 'natural' (to the Catholic Alexandrians,Athan.apol. 61.3,p.141.20); and he never says that Christ is identical with nature. Constantine and the Orator see nature as potentially corrupting unless subjected to the ordering of God found in Christ.

5.4: Dualism

One of the main premises of the Oration is the common philosophical distinction between the eternal spiritual world and decaying matter. Thus God is the source of the life and perception of physical beings (156.15-19); immortal as opposed to earthly things are from God and are grasped by the spirit, not the senses (158.6ff.,160.20-6,164.6-15, 173.15-23). When applied to men, this doctrine produces a tension between the Christian concept of resurrection (154.2f.,184.12f.) and the philosophical doctrine of salvation as the purification of the immortal soul from the pollutions of the body (164.15-18,173.7-10, 189.11-14,26-9). Pfättisch (1908/70) suggested that this tension in the Oration was due to Constantine's doctrine of resurrection not having been assimilated to the immortal soul doctrine of his reviser.

This is however to expect too high a standard of consistency: the Orator accepts prevailing philosophical wisdom without having integrated it with Christian theology, and only refers to resurrection in passing. Moreover, Constantine has the same tension in his thought: his theology is subordinated at this point to accepted philosophy. Thus he states that it is God who gives us spirit (to the Numidian bishops,Opt.app.X,p.214.10f.) and accepts the resurrection of Lazarus (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.15), but makes a division between soul and body a key part of his Christological apologetic (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.4), and in the same context distinguishes between form and reality in the world along Platonic lines (to Arius,Op.3,34.32). The views of Constantine and the Orator on the nature of the world, and God's activity in it, are fully consistent.

6. SALVATION

Neither Constantine nor the Orator express a coherent doctrine of salvation. The Orator does however have particular emphases in particular contexts on how men come to know God, which can be compared with ideas in the Constantinian documents.

6.1: The Ministry of Christ

The Orator stresses salvation being given through Christ's ministry on earth, namely his teaching and miracles, rather than through his death and resurrection. God in Christ gives instructions which bring eternal life (167.4-11); Christ saves from evil and teaches blessed doctrine (169.16f.); his miracles convince the non-intellectual (170.3-7) and form a solid foundation for faith (176.3-6). Constantine's Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.14-18) similarly emphasises the efficacy of Christ's teaching and miracles, although he does not relate them directly to salvation.

6.2: Moral life

There is distinct evidence in the Oration of the idea that salvation is given on the basis of right living. The Orator states that those who pass a life of virtue and obey God's commands will go to heaven (164.15-18,173.27-31), which could refer to religious as well as moral virtue; but he is less ambiguous in saying that those who live rightly may be judged worthy of eternal life by the Son of God

(168.3ff.), and plainly states that God is pleased with right conduct and judges us on the basis of our actions (189.16-190.3,192.23f.). The overall context of faith remains, but the Orator is emphasising the importance of right living within the life of faith in order to win the approval of God (compare 159.31-160.12). Constantine does not include such sentiments in his letters, although in writing to Sapor he does portray God as a just judge (v.C.4.10.2ff.): this is not surprising given that his concern is to promote right worship in the context of conflict about ways of serving God, and he naturally assumes that right worship will lead to virtue (e.g.to the Provincials,v.C. 2.48). The Orator has a more apologetic intent, allowing perhaps for the possibility that virtuous pagans may win the favour of God by their actions, an apologetic intent reflected in the letter to Sapor.

6.3: Worship and repentance

The opening sentence of the Oration (154.4-9) describes the Passion as the path of everlasting life for those who worship God. Worshippers are later said to be the object of God's care (155.24f.), who have guilt removed by the waters of baptism (184.8f.). The Orator further makes reference to the saving repentance that leads to true worship (165.20-166.7), and the necessity of seeking after divine things in order to find eternal life (173.10-14,173.31-174.3). Constantine also allows the possibility of repentance (e.g.to the African Catholics, Opt.app.IX,p.213.23ff.); and in his emphasis on right worship as the law of God he repeatedly acknowledges that God's salvation comes through right worship (e.g.to the Orientals,v.C.2.24.2;to the Synod of Arles,Opt.app.V,p.209.8f.). Overall, Constantine and the Orator have views about salvation which appear to be consistent, but which are expressed in too fragmentary a fashion to be certain about.

6.4: Eternal destiny

The Orator believes in heaven for the souls of the righteous after judgement (164.15-18,171.2ff.,172.32-5,173.29ff.,184.3ff.,189.10-14,26-29,192.31f.), and also in eternal punishment for the wicked (164.20ff., 173.1-7,190.2f.), describing eternal punishment by the classical motifs of Acheron and the pit of unquenchable fire. Constantine not only has an equal emphasis on eternal life (e.g.to the Nicomedians, Op.3,27.5; compare Dörries 1954/151), but also, in the two references in his letters to eternal punishment, uses the same motifs as the Orator of punishment under the earth (to the Orientals,v.C.2.27.2) in

the gulfs of Acheron (to the Provincials,v.C.2.54). The two authors have the same ideas about eternity.

7. THE CHURCH

The doctrine of the church expressed in the Oration is bound to be different from that found in the letters of Constantine. The Oration is an apology delivered to a Christian audience; the letters are concerned largely with upholding the unity of the church in the face of heresy and schism. There are however features common to both writers.

7.1: Description

The Orator mentions in passing that the church is a holy temple (155.9ff.), guided by God's laws (184.24ff.) for the salvation of all (155.13f.). The only substantial passage on the church is a rhetorical address (155.21-4) which compares the church to a captain, a virgin, and a nurse, caring for truth and producing a river of salvation. Constantine similarly has no passage on the doctrine of the church: he refers to the church as the object of unity (e.g.on Easter,v.C.3.18.5; Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.39ff.); he defers to the decisions of bishops and synods as the voice of God (e.g.to the Synod of Arles,Opt. app.V,p.209.23ff.;to the Alexandrians,Op.3,25.5,8) and makes provision for church building (e.g.to Eusebius,v.C.2.46), but has no description of the nature of the church. It is however interesting that he uses images similar to those of the Orator to describe the church as the mother of all (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.39) and a ship with its cargo (to the Antiochenes,v.C.3.60.9). These metaphors are certainly consistent, and there is nothing in Constantine's references to the church which conflicts with the sentiments expressed in the Oration.

7.2: Church and world

Constantine regards faith and worship as inextricably entwined with the prosperity of natural and human life. Right worship brings prosperity to the state (e.g.to Anullinus,Eus.h.e.10.7.1;to Aelafius, Opt.app.III,p.206.13-23) and secures peace in public affairs (e.g.Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.40); and because Christianity is the natural religion, creation recoils from persecution (to the Provincials,v.C. 2.52,56ff.). The Orator likewise links the church and its worship to order and justice in human affairs (154.18-155.17), praying that God

would preserve public prosperity (192.25-30), and declares that creation rejoices in the just judgements of God (191.27-192.1). The concept that the order of the world depended on right worship was common in antiquity (e.g.edict of Maximin,Eus.h.e.9.7.8f.) and does not show common authorship, but does show that the ideas of Constantine and the Orator here are consistent.

8. OTHER CONCEPTUAL PARALLELS

8.1: Testimony

In both the Oration and the letters of Constantine the authors include references to themselves. There is a remarkable degree of similarity between these references, all the more remarkable in that such self-attestation is rare in contemporary authors such as Lactantius and Eusebius. In the Oration, the speaker claims that it is his particular calling to glorify Christ by his actions past and future (158.13ff.); ascribes his military victories to the protection of God's power (175.33-176.4) and piety (187.28ff.); declares that his service is in faith given through the calling of God (192.7-20); proclaims that his mission is to bring men to the knowledge of God (165.30-166.3), and testifies that he was brought from a belief in chance to trust in God by divine revelation and not by the teaching of men (166.3-15). Not only is his testimony consistent with what is known of the history of Constantine, but it also fits together with the testimony of the letters. In the letter to the Synod of Arles (Opt.app.V,p.208.23-31) Constantine states that he was originally unrighteous, but God has undeservedly helped him. He describes his mission from God in various ways according to context: the promotion of true worship (to Celsus,Opt.app.VII,p.212.9-13), the correction of others' errors (to the Orientals,v.C.2.31.2), the freeing of humanity (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.38;v.C.3.12.3), the care of the church (to the Nicomedians,Op.3,27.6), the restoration of heretics (Edict against the Heretics,v.C.3.65.2), the conversion of barbarians and the bringing of peace (to the Tyre bishops,Athan.apol.86.10f.). He has a strong sense of God calling him to his service (to the Orientals,v.C. 2.28f.) -- which may possibly indicate that he was fighting against a tendency to self-glorification by modestly proclaiming his dependence upon God, a trait also found in the Oration (156.4-7,171.14ff.,192. 7ff.). Constantine also reveres God's power and the way it has streng-

thened his faith (to the Provincials,v.C.2.55.2), a point put in the form of indirect testimony in the Oration (175.33ff.,176.3-11). The evidence of these parallels makes authorship of the Oration by Constantine more likely.

8.2: Persecutors

Pfättisch (1908/82), Dörries (1954/49) and Heim (1978/57f.) have remarked on the connection between the references to the persecutors in chapters twenty-four and twenty-five of the Oration and Constantine's statements about God punishing persecutors (to the Orientals, v.C.2.26f.;to the Provincials,v.C.2.49-54;to Sapor,v.C.4.11f.). In particular, Constantine's knowledge of Diocletian and his wretchedness (v.C.2.51) is consistent with the Orator's statements in chapter twenty-five and reinforces the case for common authorship.

8.3: Martyrdom

Dörries (1954/152,320-1) also noted that martyrdom was an important concept for both Constantine and the Orator (e.g.to the Orientals,v.C. 2.35f.,40;Or.171.12-19), and suggested that Constantine was impressed by Christian martyrs under Diocletian. The Orator goes into more detail than Constantine in discussing the conduct of the martyrs (e.g.188.7-21), natural in an apologetic work, and Constantine puts forward the idea that a martyr's reward is proportionate to the degree of their suffering (to the Orientals,v.C.2.26.1), which is not found in the Oration; but otherwise their attitudes are similar.

8.4: Paganism

The apologetics of the Oration directed against pagan religion and philosophy find echoes in the letters of Constantine. Dörries (1954/ 335,348ff.) held that Constantine's references to paganism and philosophy were similar in tone to those in the Oration, and Kraft (1955/ 125; compare Millar 1977/98-101) pointed to Constantine's links with Hermogenes and Sopater to account for his allusions to philosophy. There are some differences between Constantine and the Oration however: thus Constantine attacks pagan cults (to the Orientals,v.C.2.28;to the Provincials,v.C.2.56,60.2) in a much gentler fashion than the Oration (especially chs.4,10); this is a consequence of context rather than a difference of thinking. Constantine also puts forward an apology for allowing paganism to remain, saying that virtue was enhanced by the presence of vice (to the Provincials,v.C.2.48.2), which the Orator

does not have. But they have much else in common: the use of the teleological argument against polytheism (Or.156.19-157.16;to the Provincials,v.C.2.58); the mass of men are opposed to the truth (Or. 154.12-15,155.1ff.,etc.;to the Provincials,v.C.2.48.2); Christianity is the original religion of mankind (implicit in Or.154.9-155.4; to the Provincials,v.C.2.57). Constantine's remarks to Sapor about the blood of sacrifices, incense, and fire found in pagan religion (v.C. 4.10.1) are paralleled by the Orator's contrast of paganism and Christianity, where the latter offers bloodless sacrifices without odour or fire (171.21f.). Constantine's allusions to philosophers' disputes (to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.71.2) and Porphyry (Edict against Arius, Op.3,33.1) do not show that Constantine had as much acquaintance with philosophy as the author of the Oration, but his high regard for reason (e.g.to the Provincials,v.C.2.48.1; compare Dörries 1954/349f.) coheres with the Orator's similar respect (e.g.157.16f.). There is no evidence in the Constantinian documents to suggest that Constantine could not have written the apologetics of the Oration.

8.5: Apollo

Hartmann (1902/32) held against the Constantinian authorship of the Oration the suggestion that Constantine refers to Apollo's prophecies (to the Provincials,v.C.2.50) in a neutral way while the Orator condemns the Apollo cult (179.8-14), ignoring Constantine's similar condemnation of the delusions of the oracles (v.C.2.54). Kurfess (1949/169) however thought that the reference to Apollo was in fact an indication of identity of authorship, since Constantine as a devotee of Apollo would have known about the Sibyl; and Kraft (1955/13n.1) and Courcelle (1957) connected the statements about Constantine and Apollo in Pan.Lat.6.17,21.3ff. with the exegesis of the Fourth Eclogue, showing a further link between Constantine and the Orator.

8.6: Lightning

The Orator views lightning as the judgement of God, on Assyria (178.14), Diocletian (190.23f.) and the imperial palace (190.30). Constantine used the image of Christianity appearing as a bolt of lightning (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.1), but also saw lightning as the expression of divine vengeance (to Sapor,v.C.4.11.2;to Arius, Op.3,34.8), an idea which possibly underlies the law requiring haruspices in the case of lightning (Cod.Theod.16.10.1). There is consistency of thought here between the two authors.

8.7: Assyria

The Orator mentions Assyria four times. He holds it up along with Egypt as an example of the evils of paganism (176.29f.), notes Daniel's triumph over the tyrant of Assyria (177.23-6) whose empire was destroyed by God's judgement (178.13f.), and refers to the destruction of the Assyrian race which was cause of the faith of God (184.13f.). There is an apparent illogicality here in rejoicing at the destruction of the Assyrians while acknowledging their transmission of true faith; it is preferable to regard παραΐτιος as a mistranslation of an original Latin word which conveyed the sense of hostility to God, which fits in with the context as well as being consistent with the Orator's other statements about the Assyrians.[11] Furthermore, not only did Constantine have some respect for Daniel, putting up a large statue of him in Constantinople (v.C.3.49), but he also referred to Assyria in a fashion remarkably similar to the Orator (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.25), speaking of the Assyrians as God's enemies who convinced all the other nations of their beliefs concerning God. Constantine and the Orator shared a belief that the Assyrians were particularly opposed to God and had an effect on the religion of mankind at large.

9. USE OF SOURCES

As well as a comparison of verbal and conceptual parallels in the Oration and the Constantinian documents, it is necessary to compare their use of sources.

9.1: Bible

Writers on the Oration have noted the author's loose use of the Bible. Heikel (1902/xciii) in particular looked at the differences between the Bible and the Orator's version of it, and thought that this excluded Constantine as the author on the a priori assumption that he would have used his advisers to correct his statements; he did later however (1911/18) give parallels in Hippolytus and Gregory Thaumaturgus for the association of Noah's dove with Jesus' baptism (168.27f.). Harnack (1904/117) held that the inaccuracy of the Oration precluded a high cleric from being its author. Pfättisch (1908/68f.) saw a difference between the first and second halves of the Oration in their use of the Bible as part of his thesis of a reviser being responsible for the first half; but Rauschen (1910/70) pointed out that the inconsistency in the accounts of the Fall in chapters five and thirteen

(158.20ff.,172.14-23) compared to the commentary on Virgil (183.22-184.3) did not preclude the Oration being the work of one author, especially one so indisciplined in his use of sources. Pfättisch (1908/14) and Kurfess (1949/173n.13) tried to explain the doublet of Daniel being thrown to the lions twice (178.6-13,178.21-179.3) as either intended to show Daniel suffering first as an example to the three young men, or else as being caused by the interpolation of a marginal note on the three men into the text. Neither of these ideas explains away the problems in this passage, and it is preferable to accept with Dörries (1954/134f.) that the Bible is used loosely in the Oration, with a naive exegesis which does not look for deeper meanings or attempt to deal with problems, and a memory for scripture which is amenable to change. The Orator does not quote the Bible -- the closest he comes to it is in an elliptic reference to the saying of Jesus in Matthew 26.52 directed against violence (175.18- 22) -- but uses background material from it to elucidate his own accounts of creation (ch.5,and 172.14-23), Moses and Daniel (chs.16f.), and the birth and ministry of Jesus (168.27-169.14,170.7-12,174.10- 175.11). How does this compare with Constantine?

Wendland (1902/231), Heikel (1911/22) and Pfättisch (1908/110) held that Constantine exhibited little acquaintance with the Bible in his letters, and probably used his advisers for biblical material. Lietzmann (1953/160) thought that Constantine used the Bible subject to his own conceptions, as in the account of Jesus raising Lazarus with a staff (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.15), which he suggested came from a picture which Constantine had seen, but which Kraft (1955/112n.3) ascribed to Gnostic influence. Pfättisch (1908/13) thought that Constantine's lack of biblical knowledge supported the case for him being the author of the Oration, whereas Hanson (1973/506) thought that the Orator used the Bible too often for him to have been Constantine. Dörries (1954/299-302) analysed Constantine's use of the Bible and concluded that it was similar to that of the Orator, although Constantine had little occasion in his letters to refer to the Bible.

Constantine sees the Bible as God's inspired law (e.g.to Alexander and Arius,v.C.2.69.1;to the Alexandrians,Op.3,25.4) and the source of truth in disputes within the church (Oration to Nicaea,Gel.h.e.2.7.41), showing that he had at least some acquaintance with it. He refers indirectly to the words of scripture in a similar way to the Orator: his defence against the Donatists came from Romans 12.19 (to the African Catholics,Opt.app.IX,p.213.14f.;to the Numidian bishops,Opt.

app.X,p.215.1f.), and his doctrine of Father and Son made implicit reference to Matthew 11.27 (to Arius,Op.3,34.14). He also uses what appear to be direct quotations, but with inaccuracies or taken from unknown versions, showing a loose use of the words in the text (to the Numidian bishops,Opt.app.X,p.214.20ff.;to Arius,Op.3,34.2f.). He is dependent on the Bible for longer passages in two documents: the letter to the Palestinian bishops (v.C.3.53) draws straightforwardly from Genesis 18 for its account of the revelation to Abraham at Mamre; but in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.13-18,35f.) he writes more like the Orator in the way in which he entwines biblical material with his own ideas, e.g.in the rod raising Lazarus, the unbiblical language of the account of the walking on the water, and the metaphor of the flower of disobedience being included in the account of the Fall. The fact that it is in an oration that Constantine exhibits the clearest parallels to the Orator's use of the Bible reinforces the view that the two authors are the same.

9.2: Non-biblical sources

The Orator expounds the ideas of Plato at length in chapter nine, whereas Constantine does not refer specifically to Plato or his doctrines (so Hartmann 1902/32;Baynes 1931/56). The superficial nature of the Orator's commentary, and the lack of a context in the letters for making reference to Plato, suggest however that this is not a necessary inconsistency. The Orator also quotes the Sibyl and Virgil at length, as well as mentioning Cicero in his argument for the genuineness of the acrostic (181.6ff.). Constantine does not quote Virgil or name Cicero; but he does quote from the Sibyl in his letter against Arius (Op.3,34.19), using a version substantially different from the transmitted text, suggesting either a re-translation from Latin or else a free rendering from memory. Moreover, he not only refers periphrastically to Homer and Virgil in his letter to Optatianus Porfyrius (p.39), but he also quotes a Latin proverb found in Cicero (to the Numidian bishops,Opt.app.X,p.214.18f.;Cicero,de senectute 3.7), who may have been his source; and the reference to Acheron in the letter to the Provincials (v.C.2.54) could be drawn from Virgil (e.g.Aeneid 6.295) rather than Plato. Context is again important here: the fact that Constantine does not make as much use of sources as the Orator, while using them occasionally, does not exclude him from writing an oration with a substantial argument based on the Sibyl or Virgil. On the contrary, the way in which he appeals to a single passage of the Sibyl

once, as opposed for example to the more systematic use of sources by Lactantius, shows that he could use specific sources when they were to hand, but that he was not in the habit of butressing his arguments with continual appeals to classical authority -- a picture which is entirely consistent with the Orator's use of sources.

10. CONCLUSION

This chapter began by acknowledging the limitations inherent in comparing the Oration with the Constantinian documents. The question as to whether one author could have been responsible for writing both the Oration and the letters of Constantine can be answered in the affirmative. Similarities of words, themes, and names used for God allow for common authorship, and differences can be accounted for by divergencies of translation and context. The doctrines of the authors regarding God, Christ, the world, salvation, and the church are similar; and there are other ideas which they have in common, as well as a similar approach to sources. There is nothing which proves that the Orator and Constantine cannot be the same person, nor is there need to suppose that a literary adviser reworked Constantine's original draft. There are also parallels which are best explained by common authorship: in particular the use of ὑπηρεσία, παρουσία, and καιρός, the themes of healing and light, names used for the Son of God, the use of πρόνοια, and the testimony of the authors, are evidence for common authorship. A consideration of the historical evidence for the setting of the Oration offers the opportunity of showing whether or not this identification can be sustained.

CHAPTER VII - THE ORATION IN ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT

BOOKLIST

Barnes,T.D. 'The Emperor Constantine's Good Friday Sermon', Journal of Theological Studies, 27 (1976a) 414-23.

--- Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

--- The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine (London, 1982).

Decker,D.de 'Le "discours à l'assemblée des saints" attribué à Constantin et l'oeuvre de Lactance', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978) pp.75-89.

Dörries,H. Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins (Göttingen,1954).

Dräseke,J. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 25 (1908) 1339-44.

Fabbri,P. 'L'ecloga quarta e Costantino il Grande', Historia, 4 (1930) 228-35.

Hanson,R.P.C. 'The "Oratio ad Sanctos" attributed to the Emperor Constantine and the oracle at Daphne', Journal of Theological Studies, 24 (1973) 505-11.

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius 1, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Jones,A.H.M. The Later Roman Empire 284-602, 2 vols (Oxford,1973).

Kraft,H. Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 20 (Tübingen,1955).

Kurfess,A. 'Platos Timaeus in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 19 (1919-20) 72-81.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Pastor Bonus, 41 (1930a) 115-24.

--- 'Zur Echtheitsfrage und Datierung der Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, 1 (1948) 355-8.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 130 (1950) 145-65.

Mancini,A. 'La pretesa Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum', Studi Storici, 3 (1894) 92-117,207-28.

Marrou,H.I. A History of Education in Antiquity, translated by G.Lamb (London,1956).

Millar,F. The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.-A.D.337) (London, 1977).

Müller,C. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, 5 vols (Paris,1841-70) IV (1868).

Pfättisch,J.M. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

--- 'Die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', in ed. Dölger,F.J., Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, Supplementheft der Römischen Quartalschrift, 19 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1913a) pp.96-121.

--- Des Eusebius Pamphili - Vier Bucher über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin und des Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Eusebius 1 (München,1913b).

Piganiol,A. 'Dates Constantiniennes', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, 12 (1932) 369-72.

Rist,J.M. 'Basil's "Neoplatonism": Its Background and Nature', in ed. Fedwick,P.J., Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A sixteenth hundred Anniversary Symposium, Part 1 (Toronto,1981) pp.137-220.

Rossignol,J.P. Virgile et Constantin le Grand (Paris,1845).

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 29 (1908) 3096-9.

--- 'Eusebios von Caesarea', in ed. Pauly,F. and Wissowa,G., Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, vols 1- (Stuttgart,1893-) VI (1909) coll.1370-1439.

Smith,W. (ed.) Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, 2 vols (London,1854-7).

Wallace-Hadrill,D.S. Eusebius of Caesarea (London,1960).

Wendland,P. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen: Eusebius Werke 1, hrsg. von I. Heikel, usw.', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 22 (1902) 225-36.

Winkelmann,F. 'Zur Echtheitsfrage der Vita Constantini des Eusebius von Cäsarea', Studii Classice, 3 (1961) 405-12.

--- 'Zur Geschichte des Authentizitätsproblems der Vita Constantini', Klio, 40 (1962) 187-243.

--- Eusebius Werke 1.1. Uber das Leben des Kaisers Konstantins, GCS (Berlin,1975).

1. INTRODUCTION

The Oration does not contain only theological apologetic. Part of its author's case for the truth of Christianity is the argument that its superior power is shown in the events of the present day. The deaths of the persecutors and the victories of Constantine bear witness to the truth of the gospel. But the Orator's use of history brings with it the problem of fitting the document into a historically coherent context, and raises the question of whether Constantine was capable, not only of writing an oration in this form, but also of writing the apparently obscure allusions to contemporary history which it contains. Heikel (1902/xcviii) highlighted the problem by his observation that it was strange that an imperial oration should show such a poor knowledge of the emperor and of history. Does what we know of Constine's history allow him to be the author of the Oration? Do the historical references in the Oration exhibit confusion and not fit into what is known of the history of the Constantinian period? If not, when could the Oration have been delivered?

In order to answer these questions, the chapter is divided into four sections. The first is concerned with whether Constantine's background and imperial practice allow him to be the author of such an oration; the second analyses the Orator's historical allusions; the third looks at the external history of the Oration as a document; and the final section draws these together to see whether it is possible to give the Oration a specific historical setting.

2. THE HISTORY OF CONSTANTINE

2.1: Education

Prior to his accession to the purple in York in July 306 while in his early thirties, Constantine had spent some years at the court of Diocletian; before then he presumably received an upbringing befitting the son of a high imperial official (see Barnes 1981/3;1982/39f.). Some opponents of the Constantinian authorship of the Oration (e.g. Rossignol 1845/vif.;Heikel 1902/xcvii) thought that Constantine could not have written the Oration because he neither knew Greek nor had the education or ability. But Mancini (1894/98) pointed out that Constantine would have learnt Greek while he was at Nicomedia, if not before. Moreover, the fact that Constantius was a patron of literature and rhetoric suggests that his son would have received a good classical as

well as military education (compare Marrou 1956/309f.), which would have included a grounding in rhetoric and classical literature, especially Virgil (compare Jones 1973/1003;Marrou 1956/252). Constantine's literary concern is attested (see Dörries 1954/147): his letter to Optatianus shows his awareness of poetry; the appointment of Lactantius as the tutor to Crispus suggests some concern for good education (compare Barnes 1981/74); and he supported the scholarly work of his secretaries (see Cod.Theod.6.36.1). Also, Eusebius portrays him as particularly concerned with matters of doctrine and philosophy (v.C. 4.29,33ff.;compare Jones 1973/84;Millar 1977/205). The implication of these statements is that Constantine was an educated man, although the extent of his education is unknown (compare Barnes 1981/74); he could have been responsible for the thoughts in the Oration, and the exposition of Virgil could have been his idea. The Orator acknowledges (155.30-156.2) his status as an amateur theologian, and shows himself subsequently to be an amateur philosopher, both being consistent with what we know of Constantine.

2.2: Language and composition

The idea put forward in chapter V that the Oration was composed in Latin and delivered in Greek fits with the fact that Constantine knew Greek well enough to use it in official conversations at Nicaea (v.C. 3.13), but preferred to think in Latin (v.C.3.13,4.35). Millar (1977/98-101) points out that Constantine had learned and able men at court, who could have advised him on composing orations, and also (pp.204, 226) that like Augustus he would have needed help to translate a speech because of the higher standard of Greek required in rhetoric, which a Latin emperor who knew Greek would find it difficult to attain. Although Millar (pp.204f.,219ff.) acknowledges that emperors normally used secretarial help to some degree in composing letters, he also points out that Constantine could write his own letters, and apparently did write his own speeches. It is impossible to prove that Constantine wrote the original draft of the Oration with no assistance; it is reasonable however to assert that the finished draft represented his own ideas, and that the translation of the Oration was a technical and relatively literal one within the confines of the requirements of rhetorical style, and not a substantive re-writing. The hypothesis of Pfättisch (1908/66ff.) that a reviser is required to explain the form of the Oration is not necessary. If Constantine delivered it in Greek

in the form in which we now possess it, then it can be said to be as fully the work of Constantine as are his letters.

2.3: Testimony

There are three points where the Orator refers to his own particular experience. Do these fit with the experiences of Constantine?

2.3.1: God's revelation (166.7-15) Kurfess (1930a/123) saw this as a reference to Constantine's conversion, which he held to have happened only a few months before the Oration was delivered (in 313). Dörries (1954/242ff.) translates this section to mean that Constantine was given God's revelation from earliest youth, and associates it with Constantine's sense of calling as found in his letters, not with his conversion. Barnes (1981/325n.148) interprets it like Kurfess as a reference to conversion in the prime of life, interpreting εἴ που as siquidem. It is very tempting to identify this revelation with the 'conversion experience' of 312, but the passage is too general and ambiguous to support this. The Orator may be giving an apology for not having been an avowed supporter of Christianity until the prime of life; but he may also be assuring his hearers that there is no bar to mature pagans giving their allegiance to the faith. The unclarity of the Greek means that no certain conclusion can be drawn as to whether the Orator regarded himself as a late convert to Christianity; and there is no definite content given to the revelation, when a direct reference to the vision of the cross would surely have been less obscure. The fact that Constantine does not refer to this vision in his letters suggests that it was rather less important for him than it has been for us; the ambiguous testimony here fits better with the view that in 312 Constantine made explicit his implicit Christianity, than with the view that the vision of the cross marked a major turning point in Constantine's religious development (compare v.C.1.28.1).

2.3.2: Palace fire (190.24-9) The Orator claims to have been an eyewitness of a fire at Nicomedia under Diocletian, which destroyed part of the palace and which was caused by lightning sent by God as aid to the righteous. This detail could have been taken by a later forger from Lactantius or Eusebius, although the ascription of the fire to lightning rather than Galerius suggests an independent account (see above III.4.5). Its fits very well however with the history of Constantine, who was based in Nicomedia during 304 when the fire took

place (so Barnes 1981/24), and could well have been at the palace along with Diocletian and Galerius.

2.3.3: Memphis and Babylon (176.30-177.6) After inveighing against human sacrifice, represented in the practices of Assyria and Egypt, the Orator goes on to speak of the befitting judgement on those nations which he had seen in the ruins of Memphis and Babylon. Fabbri (1930/231f.) pointed out how unlikely it would be for a forger to have invented such a detail; Heikel (1911/25) described it as a fiction attributable to the mention of the Assyrians in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.25). Pfättisch (1908/17) thought that Constantine must have gone to Egypt with Diocletian in 296, and with Galerius against the Persians in 297: he pointed out that Ammianus Marcellinus (Hist. 22.14.16) said that Memphis was populated, not a waste, but thought that Constantine must have been exaggerating, or that there was an incorrect translation. Dräseke (1908/134lf.) referred to Strabo (Geog.17.1.32) also calling Memphis a large city, and thought that a forger must have been responsible. Hanson (1973/505f.) said that insufficient was known about the history of the period to be sure whether or not Constantine could have visited Memphis and Babylon, but that it seemed very improbable. Barnes (1982/41f.) used this passage as evidence for Constantine going with Galerius to Mesopotamia in 298/9; he also argued (p.4ln.59) that the Orator described first the ruin of Memphis by Moses (177.5-23) and then the ruin of Babylon under Daniel, though the city is not mentioned by name (177.23-179.3). Barnes' interpretation of the Oration does not however accord with its contents: the Orator is thinking generally of God's victory over Egyptian and Assyrian religion, but focuses on Moses and Daniel, not the ruin of the two cities. Barnes does not explain the apparently unhistoric reference to a ruined Memphis.

As far as the historicity of this account is concerned, it must be admitted that no certain conclusions can be drawn. But it is possible for Constantine to have seen Memphis and Babylon while campaigning with Diocletian and Galerius (compare Barnes 1981/17f.). Also, the Orator may be contrasting Memphis as the capital of the Pharaohs which was punished by God with the shrunken, though still populated, town of his own day (compare Smith 1857/art.'Memphis'); and there may be some obscurity of translation.[1] Constantine could have written these lines, and any obscurity could be due to his own unclarity of memory

or expression. The historical testimony of the Orator is consistent with him being identified as Constantine.

3. HISTORICAL ALLUSIONS

3.1: Suggestions

In chapter twenty-two the Orator refers to the success of Christianity against pagan persecution, and mentions ἡ φιλτάτη πόλις (188.2) which chose an unworthy ruler who was soon punished, as well as saying that some of those at Rome rejoiced in the persecution (188.10f.). In chapter twenty-five he refers to persecution under Diocletian and then speaks of his army being destroyed after coming under the rule of an usurper, when ἡ μεγάλη πόλις was freed (191.24-7); and in chapter twenty-six he mentions battles and a war which men have seen was won by God's providence (192.18ff.). There has been much discussion on the question of how these allusions are to be interpreted. Heikel (1902/xciv,cf.;1911/44), followed by Hanson (1973/505) thought that a forger had confused Maxentius, Maximin and Licinius from Eusebius' h.e. and v.C.; chapter twenty-two referred to Maxentius in the first part and Maximin (following the chapter-heading) in the second, and in chapter twenty-five it was Maxentius who was cruel and caused civil war, not Diocletian. Pfättisch (1908/15f.) disagreed with the idea of forgery, and thought that in both chapters Maxentius had been run together with another emperor -- Maximin and then Diocletian -- but that his overthrow was the main concern of the Orator. Schwartz (1908/3099) accepted that chapter twenty-two referred to Maximin, but thought that Licinius rather than Maxentius could be spoken of there and in chapter twenty-five, as part of his view that the Oration was written after Nicaea; he explained the destruction of Diocletian's army by the fact that it passed to Severus and Galerius. Kurfess (1919-20/80;1930/121) also thought that the first part of chapter twenty-two must refer to Maxentius, whose name was deleted out of a desire not to offend the Romans to whom Constantine was speaking, and that the references to Maximin's persecution in the rest of the chapter showed that he was still alive, contributing to his case that the Oration was written in 313.

3.2: Barnes' thesis

It has been left to Barnes (1976a) to challenge the common interpretation of chapter twenty-two as referring to Maxentius (or Licinius) and Maximin. He amended the chapter-heading from Maximin to Maximian (i.e.Galerius), following the similar error in the heading of v.C.1.47 (p.5.4). The whole of chapter twenty-two then refers to Galerius, apart from the allusion to Rome (188.10ff.) which has crept in from the history of Maxentius. The city referred to at the beginning of chapter twenty-two is Serdica, where Galerius died shortly after taking up residence. Chapter twenty-five does not refer to Galerius, since he has been mentioned already: the destruction of Diocletian's army applies to the defeat of Licinius in 316/7, and the city whose people were then liberated (191.26f.,192.1-6,18ff.) is Serdica, where Constantine is delivering the Oration.

This solution appears to be fairly neat, but begins to come apart under closer inspection. The emendation of the chapter-heading is in theory possible; but the heading is in two parts, first giving notice of the emperor's thanks to Christ, and then announcing the condemnation of the persecutor Maximi(a)n. The other chapter-headings in the Oration summarise the contents of the chapters they are attached to, with the exception of chapter twenty-five which refers to Diocletian alone -- perhaps indicating the editor's confusion about who is referred to in the rest of the chapter. The natural inference from the heading of chapter twenty-two is that Maximi(a)n is spoken of in the second part of the chapter, and the subject of the first part is not identified. To identify the city as one where Maximian (Galerius) ruled is thus not justified. Nor does Barnes explain why or how an allusion to Rome crept in; there is no reason at all to allude to Rome or Maxentius if Galerius is the subject of the chapter. The identification of the city is itself difficult: if it is Serdica, where Galerius took up residence perhaps in 303 (compare Barnes 1976a/422), then his death in 311 is hard to reconcile with the statement that his punishment followed παραχρῆμα (188.3f.) on his acceptance there.[2] A reference to Galerius would surely have made more plain the awfulness of his death and its testimony to God's judgement. The references to liberation need not apply to one particular city: they were commonplaces of propaganda for every victor (compare Barnes 1981/287n.21;CIL VIII.7005(Constantine),XI.6669(Julian)). If Constantine was speaking in 323 or 324 rather than in 317 (so Barnes 1981/323n.115) then the argument that this refers to the recent liberation from Licinius

falls. It is not surprising that Barnes has become less confident in the veracity of his case (1982/69n.99).

3.3: Resolution

A clearer understanding of these historical allusions is attained by a closer examination of the text. The question of identifying the city and ruler at the beginning of chapter twenty-two is made harder by the use of παραχρῆμα: if it means that the ruler was convicted quickly after his assumption of power, then it can apply only to minor usurpers; Maxentius, Galerius and Licinius held power for some years. The context however suggests that Constantine is speaking in a city which had seen his victory while unfortunately being on the losing side, and he introduces this allusion to explain how a once hostile city could now praise God for his victory. παραχρῆμα is either an unusual translation meaning 'presently' and refers to events which have only recently happened; or it bears its usual sense of 'immediately', referring to the speed with which the ruler was convicted and removed after Constantine's victory, rather than to the swift overthrow of an usurper. The context also implies that the ruler was not primarily a persecutor: Constantine proceeds in his address to Piety to refer in great detail to persecution, but skirts round the fate of the ruler. It is thus unlikely to be Galerius or Maximin: it could be Maxentius, who did not persecute (compare e.g.Kraft 1955/17), but it is extremely unlikely that Constantine delivered this oration in Rome; it is more likely to have been Licinius (compare S.Mazzarino in Barnes 1981/325n.144), whose persecution was not severe (compare Barnes 1981/71), and to whom Constantine was referring while speaking in a great city, probably Nicomedia. The speed of Licinius' condemnation is a reference to his swift exile after his surrender; the Orator shies away from the details of what happened, possibly because Constantine wanted to avoid mentioning the painful necessity for the unofficial execution of his rival. The events are thus glossed over because they took place only recently.

What then of the persecutor in the second part of chapter twenty-two? The key to understanding this is the reference to persecution ὑπὸ τυράννων (188.9). There is no particular link between the persecutors and the ruler in chapter twenty-two as Barnes maintained; rather, in the second part of the chapter, the Orator adds to his proofs of God's power from prophecy and military victory the testimony of the power of the martyrs. The reference to persecution is both

general and particular: the tyrants are attacked as if one man (188.21-33), who is a general representation of the persecuting rulers rather than a specific individual;[3] the actual description of a field of persecution (188.10-21) is drawn from Constantine's memory of an event at Rome while he was there with Diocletian at the end of 303 (compare Barnes 1981/25). The name of Maximin was put into the chapter-heading because the editor wanted to identify the man whom the Orator was attacking, and Maximin was the last emperor to have violently persecuted the Christians in the East. The name is the interpretation of the editor, who pardonably misunderstood the argument of the Orator, and is not a mistake which should be amended. The mention of the city of Rome is intended to identify the place where this particular event took place, and is not an allusion to Maxentius: it might also have been intended to be a favourable contrast between the old imperial city and the emperor's eastern capital. This assessment of chapter twenty-two agrees with the text as it stands and puts it firmly into a Constantinian context.

As for chapters twenty-five and twenty-six, the reference to battles and victory is to Constantine's final victory over Licinius in 324. Diocletian's army was that of the East, which Licinius controlled; the charge that he seized the rule of the empire by force was Constantinian propaganda to excuse the attack of 324; the liberation of the great city is again a reference to the place where the Orator is speaking; and the destruction of the army πολλοῖς καὶ παντοδαποῖς πολέμοις (191.27) applies well to the land and sea engagements of the final campaign against Licinius (compare Barnes 1981/76f.). The questions surrounding the historical allusions in the Oration can be solved satisfactorily by dating the writing of the Oration after the battle of Chrysopolis.

4. DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

As well as considering how the contents of the Oration fit into their historical context, it is necessary to consider three aspects of the history of the document: the question of its relationship to the v.C.; the chapter-headings; and the titles of Constantine and the work itself.

4.1: The Oration and the v.C.

Eusebius (v.C.4.32) promised to annex an oration to his encomium of Constantine: and all the MSS of the v.C. (so Wendland 1902/229; compare Winkelmann 1975/ix-xvi) contain it. Heikel (1902/xci,cii) used as an argument against the genuineness of the Oration the fact that Photius in the ninth century knew of only four books in the v.C. and no appendix. The Oration is referred to as the fifth book of the v.C. in the title of the chapter-headings in the MSS V and M (tenth and twelfth centuries) and then in the fourteenth century by Nicephorus Callistus and MS G (so Winkelmann 1975/xv,xxxi); this suggests that it was seen by other writers either as an appendix to the v.C., or else as the work of Constantine and not Eusebius (compare Wendland 1902/229). The tradition that it was the fifth book of the v.C. may have arisen from the provision of chapter-headings (compare Pfättisch 1908/11f.); that it was not important until a later period may be surmised from the fact that at the end of the chapter-headings V has λόγος ε in the margin while M has λόγος πρῶτος (Heikel 1902/153). As Wendland (1902/229f.,232) pointed out, the evidence suggests that the Oration was joined to the v.C. in the uncial archetype of the MSS, with a Eusebian type of chapter-heading, and that Eusebius only had to do the job of a librarian in joining it on. The separation in some MSS of the letter to the Orientals (v.C.2.24-42; see examples in Heikel 1902/xiiif.) is further evidence that Constantinian material could circulate in association with the Eusebian corpus without being assimilated as Eusebian. The genuineness of the v.C. itself has been doubted because of its omission from Jerome's list of Eusebius' works in vir.ill.81, but as has been shown (Winkelmann 1961) this list is incomplete; and acceptance of the genuineness of the v.C. (see Winkelmann 1962;Wallace-Hadrill 1960/45ff.) suggests that the Oration can be accepted as genuinely that joined on in the Eusebian period, rather than a later forgery.

Barnes (1981/271) thought that Eusebius appended the Oration in order to support his own theological views. This however begs the question as to whether it was Eusebius or 'his posthumous editor' who appended it. The possibility that the laus was added by an editor who muddled up one of Eusebius' speeches (so Barnes 1981/271) shows that some caution is needed. Even if it is assumed that the Oration we possess is the particular one chosen by Eusebius, as the title in v.C.4.32 suggests, the reasons for his choice are not known: he says only that he is giving an example of Constantine's work, which may

have been the only oration available to him rather than a carefully selected specimen from a number of possibilities.

4.2: Chapter-headings

Heikel (1902/ciii) said that the chapter-headings of the v.C., and therefore the Oration, were not Eusebian but the work of a later Byzantine author. Schwartz (1909/1427) argued that the tradition of numbering the Oration as the fifth book of the v.C. showed that the chapter-headings were the work of Eusebius, who treated the Oration in the same way as his own work. Winkelmann (1975/xlviiff.) reconciled the argument by regarding the chapter-headings as having been added shortly after Eusebius' death. Barnes (1976a/418-21) accepted this as part of his justification for amending Maximin to Maximian in the heading of chapter twenty-two, since the heading was written by a contemporary of Eusebius who knew of the events described, and simply made a slip of the pen.

Winkelmann's conclusion is however open to a different interpretation: that the author of the chapter-headings of the Oration, being neither Constantine nor the historically learned Eusebius, simply did not know to whom chapter twenty-two referred, and made a reasonable guess (see above 3.3). The heading thus cannot be amended to produce Barnes' desired result. This interpretation is encouraged by the contents of the other headings to the Oration, which are not particularly faithful to the exact wording and content of the chapters which they describe. For example, the heading of chapter one (151.2ff.) mentions ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, when the Logos is not mentioned in the chapter, and similarly in chapter three (151.7ff.); the heading to chapter five (151.11f.) calls Christ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός, when the chapter does not refer to the Son, and in any case the Orator uses παῖς of the Son (see above VI.3.2.1); the headings of chapters eleven and eighteen (152.3f.,19ff.) call Christ κύριος, which the Orator does not; and chapter nineteen refers to 'Maro' while the heading (152.25) has 'Virgil'. This strengthens the impression that the Oration was joined on to the v.C. and then one person gave them both chapter-headings, allowing them to be seen erroneously as part of the same work. Unlike the v.C. however, the headings in the Oration do not supply information lacking in the text (compare Winkelmann 1975/xlviif.), but are attempts to summarise the contents of the chapters in the editor's own words.

4.3: Titles

4.3.1: The Oration Heikel (1902/xci) noted that the title given to the Oration in the MSS VJMA was τῷ τῶν ἁγίων συλλόγῳ, but the title in v.C.4.32 was τοῦ...συλλόγου in VAB, while JN had the dative form. Pfättisch (1908/12f.) suggested that Eusebius' construction dictated a genitive, even though the construction is exactly the same as in the title at the beginning of the Oration. Winkelmann however(1975/132.14) put the dative form into the text of the v.C., and noted elsewhere (p.x) that V made small errors; it is noteworthy that V again replaces a dative by a genitive in the words following the title in v.C.4.32 (p.132.14f.). There is neither evidence nor need for Heikel to resort to circuitous explanations of how this difference arose: it is due to a copying mistake.

There is a further aspect to the form of the title however. Barnes (1976a/417) thought that Eusebius was responsible for the main title, and that Constantine or his copyists affixed the short title preserved only in V (154.1). It is noteworthy that Constantine in his letters never uses ἅγιοι to mean 'the saints', while Eusebius does (e.g.v.C.2.61,p.72.27); further, Eusebius does not use σύλλογος in the v.C., and Constantine only uses it once in his letters, when speaking of the assemblies of Athanasius' opponents (to the Catholic Alexandrians,Athan.apol.62.3,p.142.7). The title of the Oration represents an exceptional usage for both Constantine and Eusebius, although not an impossible one, and it is more likely to have been a title affixed in chancellery to denote which of the emperor's orations this was. The second short title in V is not the original title, but was added by the copyist in the same way as he added his own titles to Constantine's letters in the v.C. (compare Winkelmann 1975/ix).

4.3.2: The emperor This conclusion is significant because of its implications for the debate about the imperial title in the Oration. Heikel (1902/xci) followed by Hanson (1973/506) thought that the genuineness of the Oration was impugned by the short title Κωνσταντῖνος Σεβαστός (154.1): a genuinely Constantinian document should have had the full title Νικητὴς Κωνσταντῖνος Μέγιστος Σεβαστός. Pfättisch (1908/13) thought that this showed the genuineness of the Oration, since a forger would have used the full title, and he pointed to other examples of the short title in Constantine's works. Barnes (1976a/417) argued that because Constantine took the title Νικητής after defeating Licinius in 324 (v.C.2.19), and it then became standard in the imperial

title, the short title of the Oration showed that it was written before autumn 324. He explained the exception to the rule of imperial titles in the v.C., the short title in the post-Nicene letter on Easter (3.17,p.89.17), by arguing that V was correct to have the longer title, which had dropped out in all the other witnesses to the text.

This is not very convincing. It is more likely that V is incorrect in trying to harmonise the titles of the letters after Nicaea. Moreover, as Pfättisch (1908/13) shows, there is not such a clear picture of imperial titulature as Barnes implies. It is true that Victor/ Νικητής is standard after 324, but there are exceptions. Not only does the letter on Easter have the short title, but so do the letters to the Alexandrians (Op.3,25,p.52.1) and the Nicomedians (Op.3,27,p. 58.1), while the contemporary letter to Theodotus (Op.3,28,p.63.1) has Νικητής. The letter to the Catholic Alexandrians (Athan.apol.61.1,p. 141.4) has the title Κωνσταντῖνος Μέγιστος Σεβαστός, without Νικητής, as does the letter to John Archaph (Athan.apol.70.2,p.148.13). The letter to Arius (Op.3,34,p.69.1) has the short title, as does the introduction to the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.1,p.46.5). The full and short titles thus appear in letters to churches, bishops, and individuals; there is no consistent pattern to the use of the short title. It does not guarantee that a letter or oration is pre-Nicene. Further, the use of the short title by Gelasius shows that a later editor could apply it to Constantine; the conclusion reached above that the short title of Constantine in V is not original is consistent with this. The Oration then began with no 'official' title for Constantine at all, but was filed under the heading Βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου λόγος. The short title was used by the copyist of V because the Oration was not an official imperial document, and he did not know its date; it does not show that the Oration is pre-Nicene.

5. TIME AND PLACE

There have been five approaches to the question of the date and setting of the Oration.

5.1: Pfättisch and Rist

Pfättisch (1908) argued that the Oration contained a Constantinian kernel with the overlay of a Greek reviser, which would mean that it was never delivered as a speech. He regarded its theology however as

pre-Nicene (so 1908/106f.;1913a/98;1913b/xx), and its kernel as a Constantinian sermon delivered on a Good Friday (so 1913b/xvii). Rist (1981/157f.) thought that Constantine did give the speech at some time, although its philosophical content was ghosted, and like Pfättisch agreed on theological grounds that it was pre-Nicene: it had no reference to ὁμοούσιος, two οὐσίαι, and an Arian subordinationism. As the previous chapter has argued however (especially VI.3.2.2), the Orator's theology is consistent with that of the post-Nicene Constantine; it cannot be dated as pre-Nicene on theological grounds except by giving an anachronistic importance to Nicaea. The vocabulary and theology of the Oration cannot provide a sure basis for its dating.

5.2: Schwartz

In his review of Pfättisch's book, Schwartz (1908/3099) pointed out the weakness of Pfättisch's argument for an early dating from the logos-theology of the letter to Arius, and said that his idea of Constantine writing in Rome was incorrect because of the way in which that city was spoken about. He held that the Orator's high view of monarchy and its 'Oriental' theology meant it was written after the victory over Licinius, and that the reference to warm springs (16l.24-28) applied to the baths of Drepane in Bithynia (compare v.C.4.61). But the latter reference is to springs at Constantinople, and in any case hot springs were not confined to one area; the stress on monarchy in chapter three of the Oration is theological and apologetic, not Oriental and despotic. Schwartz's argument is not compelling, particularly in that he does not specify any particular setting.

5.3: Kurfess

After analysing Pfättisch's parallels between the Oration and Plato, Kurfess (1919-20/80f.) concluded that the Oration was pre-Nicene and that the historical allusions to Maxentius and Maximin showed that it was delivered in Rome at Easter 313, with the translation we now possess being made for the benefit of Christians in the East, possibly at Nicomedia. He restated this conclusion in later articles (1930a/121,1948/358;1950/165) but did not develop it. Dörries (1954/132f.) accepted that the Oration was given on Good Friday, and halfheartedly accepted the identification of 'the great city' in chapter twenty-two with Rome, while pointing out the problem that there was no record of Constantine visiting Rome at Easter in 313 or any other year. Apart from this objection, the view that chapter twenty-two refers to Maxen-

tius and Maximin has been criticised above (3.3); and Kurfess does not explain how his newly-converted Constantine could have been so fluent about the faith, nor why he should send his oration into Licinius' territory.

5.4: Piganiol

Further criticisms of Kurfess were set out by Piganiol (1932/370ff.): Rome had been delivered from an usurper, not a persecutor, and Constantine would have alluded in 313 to his ally Licinius and to Maximin's offensive against him. Piganiol concluded that the Oration was delivered in 323, when Maxentius (in chapter twenty-two) could be slandered as the enemy of the Christians; Constantine was more theologically aware in 323, and wanted to win over the Christians under Licinius, and so produced the Oration in Thessalonica at Easter 323 to support his cause. It is however unlikely that Maxentius is the subject of chapter twenty-two; and the view that Constantine wanted to win over Eastern Christians suffers from the defect that it assumes rather than proves that the Oration was special, translated into Greek for use as Constantinian propaganda: not only does Eusebius in no way imply that he is using a particularly important oration, but also the case developed above (V.5.3) for the Oration being delivered in Greek and not Latin means that, rather than being of particular propaganda importance, it is one of many orations, as Eusebius implies (v.C.4.32).

5.5: Barnes

Noting that Piganiol incorrectly identified the tyrant of chapter twenty-two with Maxentius, Barnes (1976a) argued from chapter-headings and titles in the Oration that it was pre-Nicene, and by identifying the tyrant with Galerius and Constantine's rival with Licinius put the Oration into the context of Easter 317-24, delivered in a city in which Galerius had resided. He used a fragment attributed to Constantine by Petrus Patricius, Ἡ ἐμὴ Ῥώμη Σαρδική ἐστιν (Müller 1868/199), to argue that the city must be Serdica and the year 317 or possibly 320. However, the fragment he uses has no context: as Kraft (1955/66) pointed out, it does not show that Constantine was anti-Roman; it could simply mean that Serdica was fulfilling the governing function of Rome at that time, not that he had a special love for the place. Barnes presumably recognised the weakness of this argument in his later work (1981/323n.115), placing the Oration in 321-4 in either Serdica or Thessalonica because of its hostile tone towards Licinius

in chapter twenty-five, and later (1982/69n.99) abandoned his earlier certainty that the context of the Oration could be identified at all. The arguments above (4.2-3) show that his reasons for a pre-Nicene dating are not sound.

5.6: Resolution

The Oration was delivered in Greek to an audience of Christians at Easter. The audience contained bishops and laity (154.5f.,155.21-5, 155.30-156.2); it was not a σύνοδος but a σύλλογος. The reference to the Passion (154.5) is to Easter as a whole rather than to Good Friday (see above VI.4.5-6). There are no compelling arguments of theology or documentary history to show that the Oration is pre-Nicene. The historical allusions to Licinius suggest that it was given in a large city shortly after the victory of Constantine in 324;[4] the later in date the Oration is reckoned to be, the less contemporary and less credible these allusions become. On the other hand, Eusebius' portrait of Constantine as a diligent student and orator (v.C.4.29), although it is not necessarily placed chronologically, fits better into the later part of Constantine's reign. The period after Nicaea would perhaps have given Constantine more leisure to pursue study; but this does not preclude him studying and writing well before then (compare v.C.1.32). On balance, the most likely date for the Oration is Easter 325 at Nicomedia, although 327-8 at Nicomedia are also possibilities; a date after 329 is unlikely because a reference to Constantinople would probably have been included, and the historical events alluded to would not have been current enough to mention. A date just prior to Nicaea would allow Constantine to see the church as united, compared to paganism (189.2), before he had realised the full extent of ecclesiastical disunity -- although this may be propaganda rather than truth.

A plausible historical context for the Oration can be outlined thus. Constantine has united the empire, liberated the East, and taken up residence in the imperial capital of Nicomedia, returning to the city he left nearly twenty years before. At Easter, 18 April 325, he marks his first celebration of the festival with the church in the East as their emperor by giving an oration to the Christians in that city, maintaining uncompromisingly his identification with Christianity over against paganism, and showing how prophecy and his own mission have proved the triumph of God. The Oration is not so much the propaganda of an aspiring conqueror as the self-confident affirmation of a successful servant of Christ, who can use philosophy and pagan litera-

ture in the service of apologetic as well as appreciating the testimonies of the martyrs. This contextualisation of the Oration cannot be certain, but it answers many of the historical problems the Oration contains; and it is interesting to note that apart from Rome, Nicomedia is the only imperial city which the Orator names (190.24). In any case, the view that Constantine spoke the Oration in Greek makes it more likely that it was first delivered after 324; and there is no reason why it should not have been written just before, or soon after, Nicaea. It is certainly possible to maintain that a coherent historical context can be found for the delivery of the Oration by Constantine.

CHAPTER VIII - CONCLUSION

BOOKLIST

Barnes,T.D. Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

Baynes,N.H. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church (London, 1931).

Drake,H. In Praise of Constantine (London,1976).

Eadie,J.W. (ed.) The Conversion of Constantine (Huntington N.Y.,1971).

Harnack,A. Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, 3 vols (Leipzig,1893-1904) II.2 (1904).

Jones,A.H.M. Constantine and the Conversion of Europe (London,1948).

Kee,A. Constantine versus Christ (London,1982).

Keresztes,P. Constantine: A Great Christian Monarch and Apostle (Amsterdam,1981).

Kurfess,A. 'Platos Timaeus in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 19 (1919-20) 72-81.

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 29 (1908) 3096-9.

--- 'Eusebios von Caesarea', in ed. Pauly,F. and Wissowa,G., Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, vols 1- (Stuttgart,1893-) VI (1909) coll.1370-1439.

1. FINDINGS

Our inquiry into the Oration has been set against a background of diverse scholarly opinions about its nature, with it being seen as anything from a thoroughgoing forgery to a genuine work of Constantine. The majority of scholars have admitted that there is some Constantinian material in the Oration, but have accepted that it has undergone some degree of independent revision, making it an unreliable source for Constantine's own thinking. Even Schwartz (1909/1427) and Kurfess (1919-20/79, quoting Harnack 1904/116f.), who argued most strongly for an original Latin oration, accepted that there had been some degree of editing in its composition, meaning that particular words or ideas in the Oration could be non-Constantinian, possibly due to the translation into Greek (see above II.4.9.4.2). Our analysis of the Oration goes further than previous scholars in regarding it as being as much a trustworthy source for Constantine's own ideas as are his letters, on the basis of the following major conclusions.

1.1: Eclogue

The commentary on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue was written in Latin on the Latin verses. It forms a coherent whole with its context, which implies that the whole Oration was written initially in Latin. The translation into Greek was relatively literal, but included as adornment some well-known classical words or phrases, particularly in the verses, which were translated separately in a Homeric style.

1.2: Sources

The inquiry into possible parallels with Lactantius, Eusebius and other writers concluded that the Orator was not directly dependent on any known sources apart from Virgil's Eclogue and the Sibylline acrostic, his use of which is not in any case paralleled closely in other literature. The similarities that exist between the Oration and other works suggest a similarity of context and a use of common ideas which fits well into what is known of the early fourth century.

1.3: Form

Compared with Eusebius' orations, the Oration is overall a relatively prosaic composition, lightened with some literary phrases and themes, but with remarkably little in the way of hyperbole and ornate language. The translators confined themselves to the occasional beautification of phraseology, and did not attempt to make the style

of the original more colourful. The use of παῖς to translate filius is coherent with rhetorical practice in the era of Constantine.

1.4: Philosophy

The interpretation of Plato in the Oration implies the use of a compendium; philosophical commonplaces are utilised in a naively rational way, and some Platonic phrases were added by the translator. The use of Plato, and the stance of the Orator towards philosophy, is consistent with the document having been written by an amateur philosopher in the milieu of early fourth century apologetic.

1.5: Apologetic

The Oration was delivered to a Christian audience at Easter. The Orator was concerned with particular questions of practical apologetic, and spoke on more of a popular than an intellectual level. The personal history of the Orator, as well as the history of Christianity, was brought into the service of apologetic. The Orator was furnishing Christians with apologetic material rather than engaging in sustained public debate with paganism.

1.6: Constantinian documents

Analysis of Constantine's letters and orations suggests that he could have written the Oration. Differences between them and the Oration can be accounted for, without recourse to the thesis of a reviser. There are verbal similarities, and apart from a general compatibility of ideas and approach there are particular themes common to Constantine's documents and the Oration which argue for the identification of the Orator as Constantine.

1.7: History

The status of the Orator as amateur philosopher and theologian with a strong sense of his own calling fits with what is known of the history and education of Constantine. The Oration can be fitted into the historical period around the time of Nicaea, possibly as exactly as Easter 325. The evidence of Eusebius suggests that, as with his other orations and at least some of his letters, Constantine composed the Oration in Latin and had it translated into Greek by specially appointed secretaries: he then delivered it in Greek to a Greek audience.

N.H.Baynes (1931/56) regarded the Oration as only partly Constantinian, and concluded that 'the student of Christian apologetic must give to the Oratio prolonged consideration; the student of Constantine's personal convictions must exercise self-denial.' The argument of our thesis has concluded that this assessment is too pessimistic: the Oration is fully the work of Constantine, in so far as any ancient documents are the work of their authors, i.e. it has quite probably been prepared with secretarial help but is as a whole the emperor's own words and thoughts. The conclusion that Constantine delivered the speech in Greek means that the document we now possess can be seen as a first-hand, not second-hand, source for the history of Constantine; he spoke and meant these particular words, and they bear the stamp of their author. It is our conclusion that the most rounded picture of Constantine which we can obtain requires a full assessment of the Oration, which alone among the Constantinian documents gives an extended insight into the religious convictions of the emperor.

2. IMPLICATIONS

A full assessment of the implications of the acceptance of the Oration as fully the work of Constantine falls outside the scope of this thesis. There are however some implications of direct relevance to recent scholarship which it is worth noting.

2.1: Constantine and history

The Oration, as Barnes has noted (see above VII.2.3.3), offers evidence that Constantine had been on campaign with Galerius in Mesopotamia in addition to his expedition with Diocletian to Egypt; it also confirms his presence in Nicomedia in 303, and offers us his own insight into Diocletian's life (Or.190.19-29). It confirms the picture given by Eusebius that Constantine was both student and author of religious tracts and orations, a picture supported by Barnes (1981/74) but denied by many previous scholars (e.g.Jones 1948/79 described him as 'simple-minded'), a picture which affects the assessment of his attitude towards Christian and pagan religion. Our assessment of Constantine's apologetic as popular rather than philosophical suggests however that Barnes goes too far in finding speculative connections between Constantine and Middle Platonism. Constantine's mind was strong and active, but his philosophical and theological gleanings

were unsupported by a systematic and coherent intellectual groundwork, as for example his speculations on the religious implications of Virgil's Eclogue went far beyond those of more theologically trained writers. The nature of the Oration as possibly one apologetic sermon among many others urges caution in accepting the view of Baynes (1931/56) that it was a sermon specially adapted for use in the controversy against paganism, or of Barnes (1981/75) that it was a political manifesto: Barnes' dating of the Oration has affected his interpretation of Constantine's attitudes before 324, which may not have been quite so confident if the Oration was written after Licinius' defeat.

A major implication of our thesis is that the Council of Nicaea has been erroneously interpreted as a watershed for the theology of Constantine, as the pre-Nicene dating of the Oration on dogmatic rather than historical grounds has done. Examination of the theology of Constantine rather suggests that, although he saw Nicaea as having fixed a theological standard for the unity of the church (compare his letter to Alexander,Op.3,32), its theology was a standard to be submitted to rather than an expression of his own beliefs, which were expressed in looser and more ambiguous language. The theology of the Oration is consistent with that of the post-Nicene Constantine, and the emperor's religious expression was not affected by Nicene terminology. Rather than Eusebius (in ep.Caes.) or Arius (to Constantine, Soc.h.e.1.26) being 'dishonest' and 'evasive' (so Keresztes 1981/131, 143) in submitting to the standard of Nicaea, they were fully in accord with the policy of Constantine (compare Barnes 1981/225ff.). It is incorrect to say that Constantine was zealous for orthodoxy rather than unity (so Keresztes 1981/135), just as it is wrong to state that Constantine cared for unity and not at all for theological truth (so Kee 1982/113).

2.2: Constantine and Christianity

Four recent books on Constantine interpret his Christian allegiance in different ways. Drake (1976) holds that Constantine was a Christian in his private life but kept to an eirenic and ambiguous official policy in order to promote religious and political harmony among his subjects. Keresztes (1981) regards the emperor as a zealous champion of orthodoxy, while Kee (1982) sees him as committed to a debased form of Christianity in which Christ played no part (p.15), using the institutional church for his own political advantage. Barnes (1981) views Constantine as having been sympathetic to Christianity from his youth,

and his conversion experience in 312 as the source of his sense of mission on behalf of the Christian God (pp.43,275); he does not however give much insight into Constantine's psychological motivation or the quality of his conviction.

The Oration as a whole implies that both Kee and Keresztes are too extreme: Constantine followed Christ, but had his own ideas, which were in conformity with the Christianity of his time, but which cannot without anachronism be described as orthodox. There are three further points in the Oration which have particular implications for the religious history of Constantine.

2.2.1: Martyrs The stress laid in the writings of Constantine as well as the Oration on the witness of the martyrs (see above VI.8.3), and the testimony of Constantine in chapter twenty-two to his own experience of Christians being persecuted, suggests that the martyrs of the Diocletian persecution had impressed him with their steadfast trust in the Christian God. That is not to say that Constantine was already 'Christian'; but to view his 'conversion' as intellectual or superstitious (compare e.g.J.R.Palanque, quoted in Eadie 1971/66ff.) is to ignore unjustifiably his prior experience.

2.2.2: Revelation The revelation of God to Constantine (Or.166.3-15) is not simply an allusion to the 'conversion' of 312, as Barnes suggests (1981/75): rather, it refers to Constantine's religious growth, of which the vision in 312 was one component. It fits together with the testimony of the letter to the Orientals (v.C.2.28f.) to give the picture of Constantine looking back on his experience to see the hand of God leading him on. The experience of 312 was not so much of 'conversion' as of 'inspiration' (so Drake 1976/74); but, against Drake, it was no chance event, but a public avowal coming out of a religious experience which had been many years in the making. Keresztes is mistaken in beginning his account of Constantine in 312 as though nothing had gone before, and (1981/182) in regarding the events of 312 as a conversion from paganism to Christianity; just as Kee (1982/13ff.) wrongly sees it as a calculated rational exchange of divine patronage with no internal religious motivation.

2.2.3: Victory The public step of adopting a Christian symbol before the battle of the Milvian Bridge was confirmed by the victory that followed. Barnes (1981/43), while fudging the question of Constan-

tine's vision, rightly points to the importance of that victory for Constantine's Christian conviction. J.Vogt (quoted in Eadie 1971/101) emphasised the aspect of 'trial by victory' without balancing it with Constantine's own religious experience: the Oration however (175.26-176.15,192.18-22) does confirm that Constantine saw God as the giver of victory, and that in his religious experience the theology of victory played a substantial part.

The Oration of Constantine presents a picture of a man who was interested in theology and philosophy, but no intellectual; a man concerned with practical and particular issues of religious adherence; a man for whom personal religious career and religion were inextricably entwined with the well-being of the state and the right worship of God. The implications of the Constantinian authorship of the Oration are unlikely to lead to a radically new picture of the character of the emperor; but they should enable us to define more exactly what can and cannot be said about his beliefs, his personality, and his motivation.

NOTES

Chapter I

1. A.Kee (1982/79-87) has, since Barnes, produced an independent assessment of the Oration concluding that it is only partly authentic. His analysis is however defective: he assumes a division between chapters twenty-one and twenty-two, and excises the name of Christ at the end of the Oration, both without any authority save his own presuppositions about what Constantine could have written, as he partly admits (pp.83,85f.). His exposition of the contents of the Oration is superficial, shown by his comments on chapter ten, and his surprising omission of the autobiographical references in chapter sixteen (pp.82f.). He shows no awareness of the critical debates on the Oration, appealing only to Heikel and Baynes. His assessment of the Oration is thus left on one side as being too superficial to form a serious contribution to our study.

Chapter II

1. Verses 38-41,28-30,42-5,21-2.
2. Compare the numerous quotations of the Sibyl in inst., e.g.7.23.
3. Kurfess (1920/92) quotes examples: e.g.v.55 πλήξειεν (but see below 4.9.2), v.59 ἀνθέξεται. See also Bolhuis 1950/80, e.g.v.40 οἶμαι.
4. Kurfess (1936c/275f.) gives quotations of ἄσπαρτος καὶ ἀνήροτος in the Sibylline Oracles, suggesting it was a well-known phrase; it comes in Od.9.123, and λάσιον κῆρ occurs in Il.2.851,16.554.
5. Compare the reading cui in v.63, section 4.10.2.1.2.
6. Compare Or.ch.4 on the corruptibility of the gods.
7. Compare PGL art.ἀνάγω B.1.
8. Compare the conclusion of Hartmann (1902/33) that the Oration is similar to Constantinian edicts in being a pedantically literal translation.

Chapter III

1. Compare the different accounts of Stevenson (1957/661-7) and Barnes (1981/13f.); also Barnes' earlier comments (1973/40).
2. There are only eight major words in common between Constantine's quotation and Orac.Sib.3.323-33.
3. Augustine civ.dei 18.23;Theoph.Autol.2.31.

4. E.g. quotations in Ps.-Justin coh.Gr.16;Athenag.leg.30.1;Theoph. Autol.2.3,31,36;Tert.ad nat.2.12.36; allusions in Or.Cels.5.61,7.53; Tert.de Pallio 2.3. Clement has seventeen quotations in paed., prot. and str.
5. See above 3.1.5: Pfättisch (1908/75) agrees with Kurfess that there is some dependence here.
6. Thus Orac.Sib.9.17f. promises revelations through acrostics, and Augustine indulges in allegorical interpretations of the acrostic form (civ.dei 18.23).
7. γενεά in Orac.Sib. bears the meaning 'generation' or 'race', not 'era'.

Chapter IV

1. Grant (1980/164) says this was in 296, while Barnes (1981/266) says it was in 301/2.
2. They are to a wider group than Eusebius alone (v.C.2.46,3.52f.), or concern matters of ecclesiastical business (v.C.3.61,4.36); the only other letter (v.C.4.35) represents a polite reply to an unsolicited book dedicated to the emperor by Eusebius.
3. E.g. Aristides, Tatian, Arnobius, Lactantius, and even Eusebius (laus 13.1-14).
4. Barnes (1977/343ff.) doubts Drake's identification, but his alternative view still accepts that laus 11-18 was delivered as one oration.
5. Wendland (1902/230n.4) asserts that this was a common Stoic phrase.
6. Possibly Porphyry or Hierocles: see Crafer (1919/xiv).
7. So ch.3 on the theology of generation; ch.9 on Plato; ch.10 mocking the poets; ch.11 on Christ; chs.17-21 on witnesses to Christ; ch.23 on the moral order of Christianity; chs.24f. on the witness of history.
8. E.g.chs.11 and 15 on the Incarnation.
9. E.g.3.42.1,p.101.14, and 3.46.1,p.103.8, where Constantine is the υἱός of Helen and his sons are παῖδες.
10. Puer was also used of grown men, but we have no examples of its application to the royal family in this way: see Barnes (1982/41n.55).

Chapter V

1. Barnes assumes an early fourth century date for Calcidius, while noting that this date is disputed (compare 1981/324n.125).

2. πόλεμοι καὶ...μάχαι also occurs in James 4.1: for classical parallels compare Dibelius (1976/215f.).
3. Statements in this chapter about Plato's use of words are based on the evidence in Brandwood.
4. (1902/in loc.); he gives the reference as being to Or.165.10, which must be due to an error.
5. Compare Ogilvie (1978/81) on this being part of Middle Platonic mythology.
6. Compare Athanasius (or.1.29,PG 26.73A) who says that if the begotten were not always with the Father, then his οὐσία would be defective in perfection.
7. As a general letter to the church: Kurfess (1950/165); as propaganda against Licinius: Piganiol (1932/372), Barnes (1981/73ff.); as propaganda against the pagans: Wendland (1902/230), Baynes (1931/56).
8. Eusebius refers to other discourses in v.C.4.29,55; the differences between the orations described in 4.29 and the Oration suggest that he was not simply making a general statement on the basis of the one oration he possessed (see above IV.2.1.1).
9. Kraft (1955/102) thought that Latin was used because the speech was an official act of state; but Nicaea was an ecclesiastical rather than a state occasion.

Chapter VI

1. παντοδυνάμος, 2.7.1,8,21,pp.46.7,47.19,49.18; πάντα δυναμένος, 2.7.10,22,23,27,pp.48.6,49.24f.,31,50.21; and compare 2.7.29,38, pp.51.5,52.29f.
2. E.g. he compared v.C.4.42 with Phd.61a, when the only similarity lies in the metaphorical use of running, which does not show any particular connection.
3. For the justification of this and subsequent statements about Constantine's use of words, see the indices at the end of Gel.h.e. and Eus.v.C.
4. Public services (v.C.2.32,62.7); service of gain (v.C.3.60, p.113.19).
5. See index to v.C.p.202; and compare maxime in the letter to the African Catholics (Opt.app.IX,p.213.15).
6. Elsewhere only in the Oration to Nicaea (Gel.h.e.2.7.5,p.47.1), and there with a similar sense.

7. The analogy is prominent in the section of 'Constantinian' testimony in chapter eleven, which reinforces the case for Constantine being the author.
8. Although Stead (1977/136) interpreted Or.160.4 to mean 'all that exists'.
9. Compare especially τὸ γεννηθέν (156.14) with γεννάω (Op.3,27.2, p.58.9f.).
10. Compare the παθόντος of Or.184.5.
11. e.g. occasus meaning 'destruction' could have been misinterpreted as occasio, 'cause'; see Lewis and Short art.occasio.5 and occasus.2.C.

Chapter VII

1. Thus ἀοίκητοι (177.2) could be a mistaken translation of indomitus, or more likely a misunderstanding of inhabitabilis: the first yielding the sense that those cities were wasted which were once unsubdued by the power of their gods; the second meaning that the cities were inhabited (not uninhabited) by the gods, since all the men had gone.
2. παραχρῆμα in the Oration and the works of Constantine usually means 'immediately', 'forthwith', and not 'suddenly'; compare e.g. Or.189.24.
3. The ideas are commonplaces: thus Diocletian attacks the Manichees (compare Barnes 1981/20) with the same charges of bringing a new religion which rejects the gods and the customs of the ancestors.
4. Decker (1978/85) suggested that the Oration was delivered to the Council of Antioch in 325: this dating was based on an erroneous interpretation of the theology of the Oration as pre-Nicene, and there is no evidence that Constantine was in Antioch for the council, or that he saw that city as particularly important; nor is it known whether it took place at Easter (compare Barnes 1981/212ff.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. REFERENCE WORKS

Brandwood,L. A Word Index to Plato (Leeds,1976).

Coleman-Norton,P.R. Roman State and Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents to AD 535, 3 vols (London,1966) I.

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 26 vols (Berlin,1893-1936).

Hatch,E. and Redpath,H. A Concordance to the Septuagint, 2 vols (Oxford,1897).

Lampe,G.W.H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford,1961).

Lewis,C.T. and Short,C. A Latin Dictionary (Oxford,1879).

Lidell,H.G. and Scott,R. A Greek-English Lexicon, ninth edition, revised by H.S.Jones and R.McKenzie, 2 vols (Oxford,1925-40).

Quasten,J. Patrology, 3 vols (Westminster,Maryland,1950-60).

2. PRIMARY SOURCES

2.1: Constantinian Documents

(Given in approximate order of date; the last two are of unknown date.)

Title	Source	English Translation
to Anullinus	Eus.h.e.10.5.15ff.	CN 10
to Caecilian	Eus.h.e.10.6.1-5	CN 15
to Anullinus	Eus.h.e.10.7.1f.	CN 16
to Miltiades	Eus.h.e.10.5.18ff.	CN 17
to Aelafius	Opt.app.III	CN 19
to Chrestus	Eus.h.e.10.5.21-4	CN 18
to the Synod of Arles	Opt.app.V	CN 20
to Probianus	Aug.ep.88.4	CN 21
Summons to the Donatists	Opt.app.VI	CN 22
Donatist Pass	Opt.app.VIII	CN 25
to Celsus	Opt.app.VII	CN 24
to the African Catholics	Opt.app.IX	CN 39
to the Orientals	Eus.v.C.2.24-42	CN 46
to the Provincials	Eus.v.C.2.48-60	CN 44
to Eusebius	Eus.v.C.2.46	CN 45
to Alexander and Arius	Eus.v.C.2.64-72	CN 47

Invitation to Nicaea	Op.3,20	CN 48
Oration to Nicaea	Gel.h.e.2.7.1-41	CN 49 part
	Eus.v.C.3.12	NPNF 1
on Easter	Eus.v.C.3.17-20	CN 52
to the Alexandrians	Op.3,25	CN 53
to the Nicomedians	Op.3,27	CN 50
to Theodotus	Op.3,28	CN 51
Edict against the heretics	Eus.v.C.3.64f.	CN 40
to Macarius	Eus.v.C.3.30ff.	CN 54
to the Palestinian bishops	Eus.v.C.3.52f.	CN 63
to Alexander	Op.3,32	CN 71
to the Antiochenes	Eus.v.C.3.60	CN 61
to the Synod of Antioch	Eus.v.C.3.62	CN 61
to Eusebius	Eus.v.C.3.61	CN 61
Summons to Arius	Op.3,29	CN 58
Instruction to Athanasius	Athan.apol.59.6	CN 72
to the Numidian bishops	Opt.app.X	CN 59
to the Catholic Alexandrians	Athan.apol.61f.	CN 69
to Athanasius	Athan.apol.68	CN 68
to Eusebius	Eus.v.C.4.35	NPNF 1
to Eusebius	Eus.v.C.4.36	CN 64
to Arius	Op.3,34	CN 67
Edict against Arius	Op.3,33	CN 66
to John Archaph	Athan.apol.70.2	CN 70
to the Synod of Tyre	Eus.v.C.4.42	CN 73
to the Tyre bishops	Athan.apol.86.1-12	CN 75
to Sapor	Eus.v.C.4.9-13	NPNF 1
to Optatianus Porphyrius	in Optatianus, Carmina	None

2.2: Greek Sources

Aristides (Arist.), Apology (apol.): ed. and trans. by J.R.Harris and J.A.Robinson, Texts and Studies, ed. J.A.Robinson, 1.1 (Cambridge,1891).

Aristotle, ethica nicomachea (eth.nic.): ed. and trans. by H.Rackham, LCL (1926).

Athanasius (Athan.), apologia secunda (apol.): ed. H.G.Opitz, Athanasius Werke 2.1, Die Apologien: 4. Apologia Secunda (Berlin,1938) pp.87-168. Trans. by A.Robertson, NPNF 4 (Oxford,1892).

--- contra gentes (gent.) and de incarnatione (inc.): ed. and trans. by R.W.Thomson (Oxford,1971).

--- oratio 1-4 contra Arianos (or.): PG 26.11-526. Trans. by A.Robertson, NPNF 4 (Oxford,1892).

Athenagoras (Athenag.), legatio (leg.): ed. and trans. W.R.Schoedel (Oxford,1972).

Clement of Alexandria (Clem.), paedegogus (paed.): ed. O.Stählin and U.Treu, Clement 1, GCS (1972). Trans. by W.Wilson, ANCL 4 (1868).

--- protrepticus (prot.): ed. O.Stählin and U.Treu, Clement 1, GCS (1972). Trans. by W.Wilson, ANCL 4 (1868).

--- stromata (strom.): ed. O.Stählin, L. Früchtel and U.Treu, Clement 2-3, GCS (1960-70). Trans. by W.Wilson, ANCL 4 (1868) and 12 (1869).

Constantine, oratio ad sanctorum coetum (Or.): ed. I Heikel, Eusebius 1 GCS (1902). Trans. by E.C.Richardson, NPNF 1 (Oxford, 1890).

Demosthenes, orationes (or.): ed. and trans. by J.H.Vince, LCL (1930).

Diodorus Siculus, History: ed. and trans. by C.H.Oldfather et al., 12 vols, LCL (1933-67).

Diognetus, Epistle to (ep.Diog.): ed. and trans. by J.B.Lightfoot and J.R.Harmer, The Apostolic Fathers (London,1891).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities (Arch.): ed. and trans. by E.Cary, 7 vols, LCL (1937-50).

Epiphanius, panarion [haereses] (haer.): ed.K.Holl, Epiphanius 3, GCS (1933).

Eusebius (Eus.), demonstratio evangelica (d.e.): ed. I Heikel, Eusebius 6, GCS (1913). Trans. by W.J.Ferrar, The Proof of the Gospel, being the Demonstratio Evangelica of Eusebius of Caesarea, 2 vols (London,1920).

--- epistula ad Caesariensis (ep.Caes.): ed. H.G.Opitz, Op.3, 22. Trans. by J.Stevenson, A New Eusebius (London,1957) no.301.

--- historia ecclesiastica (h.e.): ed. E.Schwartz, Eusebius 2, 2 vols, GCS (1903-8). Trans. by A.C.McGiffert, NPNF 1 (1890).

--- de laudibus Constantini (laus): ed. I Heikel, Eusebius 1, GCS (1902). Trans. H.A.Drake, In Praise of Constantine (London,1976).

--- preparatio evangelica (p.e.): ed. K.Mras, Eusebius 8, 2 vols, GCS (1954-6). Trans. by E.H.Gifford, Eusebius Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV, 4 vols (Oxford,1903) vol.3.1-2.

--- theophania (theoph.): trans. S.Lee, Eusebius' On the Theophania (Cambridge,1843).

--- vita Constantini (v.C.): ed. F.Winkelmann, Eusebius 1.1, GCS (1975). Trans. by E.C.Richardson, NPNF 1 (1890).

Gelasius Cyzicensus (Gel.), historia ecclesiastica (h.e.): ed. G. Loeschcke and M.Heinemann, GCS (1918).

Hermetica, Corpus Hermetica (Corp.Herm.), Asclepius (Asclep.), Stobaei Hermetica (Stob.Herm.):ed. and trans. by W.Scott, Hermetica, 4 vols (Oxford,1924-36), vol.1.

Homer (Hom.), Iliad (Il.): ed. W.Leaf, second edition, 2 vols (London, 1900-2). Trans. by R.Lattimore, The Iliad of Homer (Chicago,1951).

--- Odyssey (Od.): ed. T.W.Allen, Homerici Opera, second edition, 3 vols (Oxford,1917) vol.3. Trans. by A.Cook, The Odyssey (New York,1967).

Justin Martyr, apologia prima (1 apol.) and apologia secunda (2 apol.): ed. A.W.F.Blunt, The Apologies of Justin Martyr (Cambridge,1911). Trans. by M.Dods, ANCL 2 (1867).

--- (spurious) cohortatio ad Graecos (coh.Gr.): PG 6.241-312. Trans. M.Dods, ANCL 2 (1867).

Libanius (Lib.), Orations (or.): ed. and trans. by A.F.Norman, LCL (1969).

Macarius Magnes (Mac.Mag.), apocriticus (apoc.): ed. C.Blondel, Μακαρίου Μάγνητος Ἀποκριτικὸς ἢ Μονογενής (Paris,1876). Trans. by T.W.Crafer, The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes (London, 1919).

Oracula Sibyllina (Orac.Sib.): ed. J.Geffcken, GCS (1902). Trans. by M.S.Terry, The Sibylline Oracles, second edition (London,1899).

Origen (Or.), contra Celsum (Cels.): ed. P.Koetschau, Origen 1-2, GCS (1899). Trans. by H.Chadwick (Cambridge,1980).

Pausanias, Description of Greece (Description): ed. and trans. by W.H. S.Jones, 5 vols, LCL (1918-35).

Plato, Apology (Apol.): ed. and trans. by H.N.Fowler, LCL vol.1 (1917).

--- Crito (Cri.): ed. and trans. by H.N.Fowler, LCL vol.1 (1917).

--- Epistles (Ep.): ed. and trans. by R.G.Bury, LCL vol.7 (1929).

--- Gorgias (Gor.): ed. and trans. by W.R.M.Lamb, LCL vol.5 (1967).

--- Laws: ed. and trans. by R.G.Bury, LCL vols 9-10 (1926).

--- Phaedo (Phd.): ed. and trans. by H.N.Fowler, LCL vol.1 (1917).

--- Phaedrus (Phdr.): ed. and trans. by H.N.Fowler, LCL vol.1 (1917).

--- Politicus (Pol.): ed. and trans. by W.R.M.Lamb, LCL vol.3 (1925).

--- Protagoras (Pro.): ed. and trans. by W.R.M.Lamb, LCL vol.4 (1924).

--- Republic (Rep.): ed. and trans. by P.Shorey, LCL vol.5.1-2 (1930-5).

--- Sophist (Soph.): ed. and trans. by H.N.Fowler, LCL vol.2 (1921).

--- Timaeus (Tim.): ed. and trans. by R.G.Bury, LCL 7 (1929).

Socrates Scholasticus, historia ecclesiastica (h.e.): PG 67.29-842. Trans. by A.C.Zenos, NPNF 2 (1891).

Strabo, The Geography (Geog.): ed. and trans. by H.L.Jones, 8 vols, LCL (1917-32).

Tatian, oratio ad Graecos (orat.): PG 6.803-88. Trans. by B.P.Pratten, ANCL 3 (1867).

Theophilus of Antioch (Theoph.), ad Autolycum (Autol.): ed. and trans. by R.M.Grant (Oxford,1970).

2.3: Latin Sources

Ammianus Marcellinus, History (Hist.): ed. and trans. by J.C.Rolfe, 3 vols, LCL (1937).

Arnobius (Arn.), adversus nationes (adv.nat.): ed. A Reifferscheid, CSEL 4 (1875). Trans. G.McCracken, Arnobius of Sicca: The Case Against the Pagans, 2 vols (Westminster,Maryland,1949).

Augustine (Aug.), de civitate dei (civ.dei): ed. E.Hoffmann, CSEL 40.1-2 (1899). Trans. by H.Bettenson and ed. D.Knowles, Augustine: City of God (London,1972).

--- epistulae (ep.): ed. A.Goldbacher, epp.1-123, CSEL 34 (1895); epp.124-84, CSEL 44 (1904); epp.185-270, CSEL 57 (1911).

Cicero, de divinatione (div.): ed. and trans. by W.A.Falconer, LCL (1923).

--- de natura deorum (nat.deor.): ed. and trans. by H.Rackham, LCL (1933).

--- de senectute: ed. and trans. by W.A.Falconer, LCL (1923).

Codex Theodosianus (Cod.Theod.): Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes, ed. T.Mommsen and P.Meyer, 3 vols (Berlin,1905). Trans. by C.Pharr, The Theodosian Code (Princeton,1952).

Cyprian, de habitu virginum: ed. W.Hartel, CSEL 3.1 (1868). Trans. by R.E.Wallis, ANCL 8 (1876).

Jerome, Chronicon (Chron.): ed. R.Helm, Eusebius 7, GCS (1956).

--- epistulae (ep.): PL 30.15-308.

--- de viris illustribus (vir.ill.): PL 23.631-760.

Lactantius (Lact.), divinae institutiones (inst.): ed. S.Brandt, CSEL 19 (1890). Trans. by W.Fletcher, ANCL 21 (1871).

--- epitome (epit.): ed. S.Brandt, CSEL 19 (1890). Trans. by W.Fletcher, ANCL 22 (1871).

--- de ira dei: ed. S.Brandt, CSEL 27.1 (1893). Trans. by W.Fletcher, ANCL 22 (1871).

--- de mortibus persecutorum (mort.pers.): ed. S.Brandt and G.Laubmann, CSEL 27.2 (1897). Trans. by J.L. Creed (Dept. of Classics, Lonsdale College, Bailrigg, Lancaster, undated).

--- de opificio dei (op.dei): ed. S.Brandt, CSEL 27.1 (1893). Trans. by W.Fletcher, ANCL 22 (1871).

Minucius Felix (Min.Felix), Octavius (oct.): ed. C.Halm, CSEL 2 (1867). Trans. by R.E.Wallis, ANCL 13 (1880).

Optatianus Porphyrius, Carmina: ed. E.Kluge (Leipzig,1926).

Optatus Milevitanus (Opt.), Appendix (app.) to Libri VII, ed. C.Ziwsa, CSEL 26 (1893).

Panegyrici Latini (Pan.Lat.): ed. E.Galletier, Panégyriques Latins, 3 vols (Paris, 1949-55).

Tertullian (Tert.), ad nationes (ad nat.): ed. E.Dekkers, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 1.1 (Turnhout,1954). Trans. by S.Thelwall and P.Holmes, ANCL 11 (1882).

--- apologeticum (apol.): ed. H.Hoppe, CSEL 69 (1939). Trans. by S.Thelwall and P.Holmes, ANCL 11 (1882).

--- de Pallio: PL 2.1083-1106. Trans. by S Thelwall, ANCL 18 (1880).

Virgil, Aeneid: ed. J.W.MacKail (Oxford,1930). Trans. by J.Dryden, The Works of Virgil (London,1903).

--- Eclogues (Ecl.): ed. and trans. by G.Lee, Virgil's Eclogues, Liverpool Latin Texts 1 (Liverpool,1980).

--- Georgics (Geor.): ed. R.D.Williams, Virgil: The Eclogues and Georgics (Basingstoke,1979). Trans. by J.Dryden, The Works of Virgil (London,1903).

3. SECONDARY SOURCES

Alföldi,A. The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome (Oxford,1948).

Altaner,B. and Stuiber,A. Patrologie (Freiburg im Breisgau,1978).

Armstrong,A.H. (ed.) The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy (Cambridge,1967).

Barnes,T.D. 'Lactantius and Constantine', Journal of Roman Studies, 63 (1973) 29-46.

--- 'The Emperor Constantine's Good Friday Sermon', Journal of Theological Studies, 27 (1976a) 414-23.

--- 'The Victories of Constantine', Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, 20 (1976b) 149-55.

--- 'Two Speeches by Eusebius', Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, 18 (1977) 341-5.

--- 'Emperors and Bishops, A.D.324-344: Some Problems', American Journal of Ancient History, 3 (1978) 53-75.

--- Constantine and Eusebius (London,1981).

--- The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine (London, 1982).

Baynes,N.H. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church (London, 1931).

--- 'Eusebius and the Christian Empire', in Baynes,N.H., Byzantine Studies and other Essays (London,1955) pp.168-72.

Benko,S. 'Virgil's Fourth Eclogue in Christian Interpretation', in ed. Temporini,H., Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, vols 1- (Berlin/New York,1972-) XXXI.1 (1980) pp.646-705.

Bolhuis,A. Vergilius' Vierde Ecloga in de Oratio Constantini Ad Sanctorum Coetum (Amsterdam,1950).

--- 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen und Lactantius Divinae Institutiones', Vigiliae Christianae, 10 (1956) 25-32.

Burch,V. Myth and Constantine the Great (London,1927).

Burckhardt,J. The Age of Constantine the Great, translated by M.Hadas (London,1949).

Bureth,P. Les Titulatures Impériales dans les Papyrus, les Ostraca et les Inscriptions d'Égypte (30 a.c.-284 p.c.) (Brussels, 1964).

Cochrane,C.N. Christianity and Classical Culture (Oxford,1940).

Courcelle,P. 'Les Exégèses Chrétiennes de la quatrième eclogue', Revue des Études Anciennes, 59 (1957) 294-319.

--- 'Anti-Christian Arguments and Christian Platonism: from Arnobius to St.Ambrose', in ed. Momigliano,A., The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century (Oxford,1963) pp.151-92.

Crafer,T.W. The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes (London,1919).

Daniélou,J. Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, translated by J.A. Baker, A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, 3 vols (London,1964-77) II (1973).

Decker,D.de 'Le "discours à l'assemblée des saints" attribué à Constantin et l'oeuvre de Lactance', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978) pp.75-89.

Dibelius,M. James (Philadelphia,1976).

Dillon,J. The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220 (London,1977).

Dölger,F.J. ΙΧΘΥΣ 1 Band. Das Fisch-Symbol in Frühchristlicher Zeit (Rome,1910).

Dörries,H. Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins (Göttingen,1954).

--- Constantine and Religious Liberty, translated by R.H.Bainton (New Haven USA,1960).

--- Constantine the Great (New York,1972).

Drake,H.A. In Praise of Constantine (London,1976).

Dräseke,J. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 25 (1908) 1339-44.

Dulles,A. A History of Apologetics (London,1971).

Eadie,J.W. (ed.) The Conversion of Constantine (Huntington N.Y.,1971).

Fabbri,P. 'L'ecloga quarta e Costantino il Grande', Historia, 4 (1930) 228-35.

Foakes-Jackson,F.J. Eusebius Pamphili. A Study of the Man and his Writings (Cambridge,1933).

Grant,R.M. Theophilus of Antioch: Ad Autolycum (Oxford,1970).

--- Eusebius as Church Historian (Oxford,1980).

Grillmeier,A. Christ in Christian Tradition, second edition, vol.1 (London,1975).

Guillaumin,M.L. 'L'exploitation des "Oracles Sibyllines" par Lactance et par le "Discours à l'assemblée des saints"',in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1978) pp.185-202.

Hanson,R.P.C. 'The "Oratio ad Sanctos" attributed to the Emperor Constantine and the oracle at Daphne', Journal of Theological Studies, 24 (1973) 505-11.

Harnack,A. Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, 3 vols (Leipzig,1893-1904) II.2 (1904).

--- 'Die Bezeichnung Jesus als "Knecht Gottes" und ihre Geschichte in der alten Kirche', Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 28 (1926) 212-38.

Hartmann,W. Konstantin der Grosse als Christ und Philosoph in seinen Briefen und Erlassen, Beilage zum Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde (Fürstenwalde,1902).

Heikel,I.A. Eusebius Werke, Erster Band. Uber das Leben Constantins, Constantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung, Tricennatsrede an Constantin, GCS 7 (Leipzig,1902).

--- Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius, Texte und Untersuchungen 36.4 (Leipzig,1911).

Heim,F. 'L'influence exercée par Constantin sur Lactance: sa théologie de la victoire', in ed. Fontaine,J. and Perrin,M., Lactance et son temps, Theologie Historique 48 (Paris,1948) pp.55-74.

Jeremias,J. 'παῖς θεοῦ', in ed. Kittel,G. and Friedrich,G., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, translated by G.W. Bromiley, 10 vols (Grand Rapids,1964-76) V (1967) pp.654-717.

Jones, A.H.M. Constantine and the Conversion of Europe (London,1948).

--- The Later Roman Empire 284-602, 2 vols (Oxford,1973).

Kee,A. Constantine versus Christ (London,1982).

Kelly,J.N.D. Early Christian Creeds, third edition (London,1972).

Keresztes,P. Constantine: A Great Christian Monarch and Apostle (Amsterdam,1981).

Kraft,H. 'OMOOYΣIOΣ', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 66 (1954-5) 1-24.

--- Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 20 (Tübingen,1955).

Kraus,W. 'Vergils vierte Ekloge: ein kritisches Hypomnema', in ed. Temporini,H., Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, vols 1- (Berlin/New York,1972-) XXXI.1 (1980) pp.604-45.

Kurfess,A. 'Observatiunculae ad P. Vergilii Maronis eclogae quartae interpretationem et versionem Graecam', Mnemosyne, 40 (1912) 277-84.

--- 'Das Akrostichon Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ Σταυρός', Sokrates, 6 (1918a) 99-105.

--- 'Mitteilungen. Zu Vergil, Buc.IV,62', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 38 (1918b) 760-1.

--- 'Platos Timaeus in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 19 (1919-20) 72-81.

--- 'Vergils vierte Ekloge in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin [Appendix to Sokrates, 8 (1920)] 46 (1920) 90-6.

--- 'Der Schluss der vierten Ekloge Vergils in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung', Pastor Bonus, 33 (1920-1) 55-60.

--- 'Lactantius und Plato', Philologus, 78 (1923) 381-92.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Pastor Bonus, 41 (1930a) 115-24.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 50 (1930b) 366-8.

--- 'Der griechische Übersetzer von Vergils vierter Ekloge in Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 35 (1936a) 97-100.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantin und die Sibylle', Theologische Quartalschrift, 117 (1936b) 11-26.

--- 'Latein-Griechisch', Glotta, 25 (1936c) 274-6.

--- 'Die griechische Übersetzung der vierten Ekloge Vergils', Mnemosyne, third series, 5 (1937) 283-8.

--- 'Zur Echtheitsfrage und Datierung der Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, 1 (1948) 355-8.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologie und Glaube, 39 (1949) 167-74.

--- 'Zu Kaiser Konstantins Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 130 (1950) 145-65.

--- 'Kaiser Konstantin und die Erythräische Sibylle', Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, 4 (1952) 42-57.

Labriolle,P.de La Réaction Païenne. Étude sur la polémique antichrétienne du 1er au 6e siècle (Paris,1942).

Lietzmann,H. From Constantine to Julian, A History of the Early Church, translated by B.L.Woolf, second edition, 4 vols (London,1953) III.

Loeschcke,G. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, usw.', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 12 (1910) 357-9.

McCracken,G. Arnobius of Sicca: The Case Against the Pagans, Ancient Christian Writers Series 7-8, 2 vols (Westminster,Maryland,1949).

Mancini,A. 'La Pretesa Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum', Studi Storici, 3 (1894) 92-117,207-28.

Markus,R. Christianity in the Roman World (London,1974).

Marrou,H.I. A History of Education in Antiquity, translated by G.Lamb (London,1956).

Michel,O. 'υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ', in ed. Brown,C., The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols (Exeter,1975-8) III (1978) pp.634-48.

Millar,F. The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.-A.D.337) (London, 1977).

Mras,K. Eusebius Werke 8.1, GCS 43.1 (Berlin,1954).

Müller,C. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, 5 vols (Paris,1841-70) IV (1868).

Murphy,F. 'The Constantinian Legacy', in ed. Livingstone,E., Studia Patristica, 12 (Berlin,1975) pp.432-42.

Nock,A.D. Conversion. The old and the new in religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo (Oxford,1933).

Norden,E. Die Geburt des Kindes: Geschichte einer religiösen Idee (Leipzig,1924).

Ogilvie,R.M. The Library of Lactantius (Oxford,1978).

Opitz,H.G. Athanasius Werke 3.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites, 1-2 (Berlin,1934-5).

Page,T.E. P.Vergili Maronis - Bucolica et Georgica (London,1960).

Pfättisch,J.M. 'Der prophetische Charakter der 4.Ekloge Vergils bis Dante', Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland, 139 (1907) 637-46,736-51.

--- Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, Strassburger theologische Studien 9.4 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1908).

--- 'Platos Einfluss auf die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', Theologische Quartalschrift, 92 (1910) 399-417.

--- Die vierte Ekloge Vergils in der Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen, Programm des Kgl. Gymnasiums im Benediktinerkloster Ettal für das Schuljahr (München,1912-13).

--- 'Die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen', in ed. Dölger,F.J., Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, Supplementheft der Römischen Quartalschrift, 19 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau,1913a) pp.96-121.

--- Des Eusebius Pamphili - Vier Bucher über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin und des Kaisers Konstantin Rede an die Versammlung der Heiligen, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Eusebius 1 (München,1913b).

Pichon,R. Lactance (Paris,1901).

Piganiol,A. 'Dates Constantiniennes', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, 12 (1932) 369-72.

Places,E.de 'Numénius et Eusèbe de Césarée', in ed. Livingstone,E., Studia Patristica, 13 (Berlin,1975) pp.19-28.

Prestige,G.L. God in Patristic Thought, second edition (London,1952).

Prümm,K. 'Das Prophetenamt der Sibyllen in kirchlicher Literatur mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Deutung der 4.Ekloge Virgils', Scholastik, 4 (1929) 54-77.

--- Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt, vol.1 (Leipzig,1935).

Rauschen,G. 'Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Literarische Rundschau für das katholische Deutschland, 36 (1910) 68-70.

Rist,J.M. 'Basil's "Neoplatonism": Its Background and Nature', in ed. Fedwick,P.J., Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium, Part 1 (Toronto,1981) pp.137-220.

Rossignol,J.P. Virgile et Constantin le Grand (Paris,1845).

Schultze,V. 'Quellenuntersuchungen zur Vita Constantini des Eusebius', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 14 (1894) 503-555.

Schwartz,E. 'Referate. J.M.Pfättisch, Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, usw.', Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 29 (1908) 3096-9.

--- 'Eusebios von Caesarea', in ed. Pauly,F. and Wissowa,G., Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, vols 1- (Stuttgart,1893-) VI (1909) coll.1370-1439.

Seeck,O. Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 N. chr. (Stuttgart,1919).

Smith,W. (ed.) Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, 2 vols (London,1854-7).

Stead,G.C. Divine Substance (Oxford,1977).

Stevenson,J. Studies in Eusebius (Cambridge,1929).

--- 'The Life and Literary Activity of Lactantius', in ed. Aland,K. and Cross,F.L., Studia Patristica, 1 (Berlin, 1957) pp.661-77.

Stiglmayr,J. 'Rezensionen. Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht, von J.M.Pfättisch usw.', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 33 (1909) 346-52.

--- 'Analekten. Zur Rede Konstantins an "die Versammlung der Heiligen"', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 36 (1912) 865-8.

Storch,R.H. 'The "Eusebian Constantine"', Church History, 40 (1971) 145-55.

Telfer,W. 'The Author's Purpose in the Vita Constantini', in ed. Aland,K. and Cross,F.L., Studia Patristica, 1 (Berlin,1957) pp.157-67.

Vogt,J. 'Constantinus der Grosse', in ed. Klauser,T., Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, vols 1- (Leipzig,1941-) III (Stuttgart,1957) coll.306-79.

--- 'Pagans and Christians in the Family of Constantine the Great', in ed. Momigliano,A., The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century (Oxford,1963) pp.38-55.

Wallace-Hadrill,D.S. Eusebius of Caesarea (London,1960).

Wendland,P. 'Rezensionen und Anzeigen: Eusebius Werke 1, hrsg. von I. Heikel, usw.', Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift, 22 (1902) 225-36.

Winkelmann,F. 'Zur Echtheitsfrage der Vita Constantini des Eusebius von Cäsarea', Studii Classice, 3 (1961) 405-12.

--- 'Zur Geschichte des Authentizitätsproblems der Vita Constantini', Klio, 40 (1962) 187-243.

--- 'Zur Vorgeschichte von I.A.Heikels Edition der Vita Constantini', Eirene, 3 (1964) 119-22.

--- Eusebius Werke 1.1. Uber das Leben des Kaiser Konstantins, GCS (Berlin,1975).